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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This study was intended to examine the functioning of informal communication networks in relation to the hiring process in higher education.

Three major factors indicated the need for such a study: (a) the relative lack of empirical studies about higher education faculty and hiring processes, (b) the current higher education labor market conditions and projections for the future which affect the career plans and patterns for current and potential higher education faculty, and (c) the lack of studies in educational settings which consider the concept of sponsored versus contest mobility to help understand and explain the interactions which affect the hiring processes in higher education. Each of these factors is discussed briefly below.

The lack of empirical data about higher education faculty and hiring processes has been widely noted over the last 20 years. Eells (1962), a major chronicler of higher education literature from the mid-1940s through the 1960s, acknowledged the increased volume in general higher education literature. He believed, however, that studies were needed of faculty selection and hiring processes in addition to existing studies of faculty recruitment, i.e., recruitment into
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college teaching as a profession, not into a specific position.

Social scientists were singled out for failing to help meet the need for studies of higher education faculty. These critics included Riesman (1959): "Sociologists have seldom turned their attention to our institutions of higher learning or focused on the professor as a subject of study" (p. 264); Anderson and Murray (1971): "Perhaps because his gaze is fixed through training outward on society, the social scientist has been slow to focus upon the academic as a subject for inquiry" (p. 6); and Bennis (1973): "University researchers study everything from taxi dancers to the number seven (plus or minus two), but they have largely left unexamined their own institutions, its tribal customs and patterns" (p. 11).

Dressel and Mayhew (1974) outlined the content and growth of higher education literature from the institutional histories of the late 1800s to the major research studies of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. However, as they had done in previous higher education literature reviews (Dressel & Pratt, 1971; Mayhew, 1971, 1972, 1973), they condemned the lack of faculty studies:

Higher education is a people-using and a people-processing undertaking; the faculty, staff, and administrations who are used should be as much a focus of study as the students who are processed. Students have fared much better; significant work has been done on intellectual and attitudinal characteristics of students and their paths through the system. However, not nearly as much has been done concerning faculty. Once one has examined Logan Wilson's Academic Man (1942), Caplow and McGee,
The literature is virtually silent about how faculty members enter the profession, what kinds of people they are, how they proceed in their careers, and how they succeed in their professional tasks. These two matters should loom especially large during the 1970s and 1980s, as institutions try to make better use of their faculty resources. (Dressel & Mayhew, 1974, p. 89)

The second factor which indicated a need for this study was a combination of the current higher education labor market conditions and projections for the future. The 1950s and 1960s were a period of dramatic increases in students, faculty, and financial support for higher education. Within the past 10 years, however, the expectations of a continued high rate of expansion and perhaps a critical shortage of qualified faculty have had to be transformed to deal with the realities of a tightened job market. In such a market the mobility between jobs has decreased and finding entry level jobs has become a burden for the increasing number of new doctorates; projections indicate this trend will increase in intensity (Cartter, 1976; Trivett, 1977). Cartter (1976), who consistently dissented from the expansion projections made throughout the 1960s, said that "it is now commonly accepted that we need to improve our reporting of current labor market data, the information and search mechanisms for bringing jobs and people together, and our ability to project future needs" (pp. 2-3). To improve these mechanisms requires knowledge of what they have been and what they are now. All men
and women now employed and with career aspirations in the higher
education profession would benefit from this knowledge. Any increase
in the understanding of the processes at work in such a vital area as
job hiring would give individuals the opportunity to learn how to cope
with them and, if necessary, adjust their own functioning within that
process.

The third factor which indicated a need for this study was the
lack of studies which considered the possible relationship between
the concept of sponsored versus contest mobility and hiring processes
used in higher education. Educational literature concerned with
placement and/or personnel issues (Campbell, Bridges, Corbally,
Nystrand, & Ramseyer, 1971; Castetter, 1962, 1971; Doll, 1972;
Moore & Walters, 1955; van Zwoll, 1964) frequently alluded to a
structure accepted as legitimate and trustworthy for finding out about
available job openings, being selected for interviews, and being
offered employment, a structure that was referred to in nontechnical
terms as the "good old boy network." However, the reference to
these networks floated in a void without a framework or empirical
data. One relevant concept was outlined by Turner (1960), which he
termed sponsored versus contest mobility, where movement to or
between jobs was influenced by the information or intermediary
behavior of another party (sponsored mobility) rather than totally
equalitarian considerations (contest mobility).
Thus, the focus of this study was to examine to what extent and how informal networks have functioned and now function as part of the hiring process in higher education. These questions were addressed by first conducting a review of related literature. Then the major components of formal and informal communication networks and stages of the hiring process were identified. Data were collected for the following purposes: (a) to determine which of these components were utilized by faculty at one or more stages during the hiring process for their present employment, (b) to determine potential and perceived use of informal networks, (c) to determine changes in use of informal networks across time, and (d) to examine relationships between informal networks and specific variables such as sex and professional activity.

Outline of the Report

Chapter II presents a review of the literature related to higher education's institutional development and those factors which affected hiring processes, as well as descriptive and empirical studies of informal networks as part of the higher education hiring process. Also included in Chapter II are the conceptual framework used for the study and the hypotheses which resulted from the review of literature. Chapter III describes the methodology of the study, including sampling procedures, description of the sample, and the data analysis plan.
Chapter IV presents the results of the study. Chapter V includes conclusions and implications of the results of the study, as well as suggestions for further research and a summary of the study.
CHAPTER II

THE REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The purpose of this chapter is to present a review of the literature related to the major focus of the study: informal networks functioning as part of the hiring process in higher education. An overview of higher education's institutional development and the effects on hiring is presented, as well as descriptive and empirically-based literature related to use of informal networks in the hiring process. Also included is a brief description of the concepts which were used as a framework for the study. The hypotheses of the study which resulted from the review of the literature conclude the chapter.

Higher Education: The Context of the Past, Present, and Future

Three major interrelated factors in the development of American higher education affected the types and numbers of faculty hired: the function of higher education, students, and financing. A synthesis of Anderson and Murray (1971), Bledstein (1976), Brubacher and Rudy (1976), Henry (1975), Jencks and Riesman (1969), Ross (1976), and Woodring (1968) provided an outline of several critical historical periods and the events which caused
changes within and among the three factors. Underlying the entire
history was what Henry (1975) called "constancy of change," the
permanent presence of "institutions in transition" (Hodgkinson, 1971).
Whether relating the influence of 800 years of European higher edu-
cation practices on the development of American institutions (Ross,
1976), tracing education's growth from the 1636 founding of Harvard
as America's first higher education institution (Brubacher & Rudy,
1976), or focusing on the past 45 years (Henry, 1975), these over-
views of higher education revealed continuous adjustment and change
patterns which were necessary as institutions attempted to respond
to external and internal crises and concerns.

Higher education in this study was defined to include all post-
secondary institutions for two reasons: (a) The settings and samples
for the descriptive and empirical literature varied widely as to type
of higher education institution, and (b) the majority of the summary
statistics related to this literature review used a primary data base
of all public and private higher education institutions and did not
always include subcategories.

The First Two Hundred Years

The church-related institution dominated what was called
higher education in America for nearly two centuries. Its primary
functions were to train religious personnel and to provide some
formal education for the children of the wealthy. Thus, impetus for the beginning and continuation of such institutions came from the churches and the elite classes. The curriculum centered around the classics, a tradition borrowed from the Europeans, but improvement of social and moral character, rather than intellectual attainment, was the primary goal.

Faculty of this earliest era were primarily ministers, retired missionaries, and independently wealthy men, which kept down the financial costs, but supported the minimum emphasis on scholarship and science as ends in themselves (Anderson & Murray, 1971; Woodring, 1968). Subject specialization was virtually unheard of: A small number of faculty was expected to teach a large number of courses covering many different disciplines and levels of instruction to a widely divergent age group.

The beginning of the nineteenth century saw the emergence of "special interest colleges" (Jencks & Riesman, 1969) other than church-related institutions. These represented various subcultures striving for legitimacy as well as for perpetuation of their particular group, whether based on sex, occupation, religion, social class, or locality. Their students, financial support, and usually faculty, were obtained from the special interest group, and the curriculum reflected the concerns and needs of the group. Enrollment remained small and faculty remained unprofessionalized. The
precarious nature of such institutions was reflected in the fact that
800 colleges were founded before the Civil War and only 180
remained open into the twentieth century (Jencks & Riesman, 1969).

Thus, the relatively homogeneous beginning of American
higher education changed during the first half of the nineteenth cen-
tury and began to reflect the diversity which, as described by
Woodring (1968), continued to be a dominant characteristic:

Throughout the history of the United States, higher edu-
cation has dwelt in a state of happy anarchy. . . . Each
institution has been free to establish its own entrance
standards, decide for itself what kind of a faculty it
wished to recruit, make its own curriculum, and invent
its own degrees . . . each [separate and diverse insti-
tution] with its own history, traditions, and goals.
(p. 3)

Post-Civil War

During the last three decades of the nineteenth century, two
major developments occurred which influenced the structure and
function of higher education and gave rise to the establishment of the
concept of the professional academic man: the growth of state-
supported colleges and the establishment of universities modelled
after the German university.

The impetus for the growth of state-supported colleges came
from the Morrill Act of 1861 which provided grants of land to assist
states in establishing colleges. The post-Civil War trend toward an
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industrial economy required large numbers of trained manpower (Anderson & Murray, 1971). In addition to teaching the previous general curriculum, faculty began to focus on the specific needs of the students in such fields as teaching, business, industrial arts, and agricultural experimentation.

The German model for universities emphasized research and offered programs leading to the PhD. Most of these original universities were built on the foundations of the well-established colleges of the East, such as Harvard and Yale. Soon state institutions wanted to have university status, a trend fought by private colleges and often won when legislators refused to expand tax-supported higher education institutions (Woodring, 1968).

The universities established a need for scholars who were required, for the first time, to teach both graduate and undergraduate students, as well as conduct research and publish. As Woodring (1968) stated: "This was the beginning of the 'publish or perish' controversy--more accurately called the conflict between teaching and research" (p. 18). As state colleges maneuvered to become universities, the most expedient method was to try to increase their institutions' prestige by hiring faculty who were proven scholars in specialized disciplines.

The competition for students also had begun: secondary schools increased in number and the percentage of high school
graduates steadily rose from the 3% of 1870 (Cartter, 1976). The ratio between high school graduates and higher education enrollment remained fairly constant from 1880 through 1950: Roughly 5 out of 10 white male graduates and 4 out of 10 white female graduates would attend college (Froomkin, 1970).

1900 Through World War II

The period between 1900 and World War II was one of unprecedented growth in numbers of institutions and enrollments, despite the depression years of the thirties. Secondary schools were well established and between 1920 and 1940 attendance had become the norm (Cartter, 1976). The country was more affluent than ever before, and the public increasingly believed that higher education was required--and should be tax-supported--to meet the needs of advancing technology and preparing professionals for numerous fields (Anderson & Murray, 1971; Jencks & Riesman, 1969).

The types of higher education institutions did not change and earlier trends were continued. Fewer church-related and special interest colleges were established and their numbers declined as sources of income and endowment were most frequently available to the small minority of prestige institutions. Even though each of the less prestigious institutions usually had a few dedicated competent faculty, competition for scholars increased, and more of the younger
faculty began to move to state colleges and universities (Woodring, 1968). The beginning spread of a discipline orientation rather than institutional loyalty was partially attributed to the fact that the dozen most prestigious universities accounted for 55% of all PhDs between 1926 and 1947 (Jencks & Riesman, 1969). Although their first jobs might be in smaller institutions, these PhDs' identification with a discipline created a desire to be in institutions where research and a national reputation were possible (Woodring, 1968).

Another earlier trend continued: lack of agreement on the function of higher education. Veblen, a scholar of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, represented the elitist view of scientific and scholarly inquiry for pure knowledge as the only purpose of higher education, and scoffed at any compromises (Woodring, 1968). Dewey, on the other hand, criticized the classical curriculum as inadequate preparation for modern life (Blanshard, 1959). Both views and those inbetween caused Hutchins in 1936 to say, "The most striking thing about the higher learning in America is the confusion that besets it" (Woodring, 1968, p. 1). Despite the confusion brought on by rapid changes throughout society, "by the outbreak of World War II the majority of the nation's college students attended institutions staffed by academic professionals" (Jencks & Riesman, 1969, p. 21).

The advent of World War II brought on the sharpest enrollment
decline in the twentieth century (Russell, 1946), and "many faculty members left the campus for war-related employment or for government service, both military and civilian. Vacancies had to be filled on short notice from a dwindling supply of teachers" (Henry, 1975, p. 42). For the first time faculty in large numbers became involved in federal science and technology programs, which led to substantial increases in federal support for academic research (Jencks & Riesman, 1969; Woodring, 1968).

Post-World War II

Following World War II, the financial involvement of the federal government through the G. I. Bill became more pronounced as "the enrollment of World War II veterans created the most rapid growth of colleges and universities in the history of higher education" (Henry, 1975, p. 55). The declines during World War II were immediately reversed as 1945-46 saw an enrollment of 1.5 million students, a number that grew steadily for the next decade (Dressel & Mayhew, 1974, p. 16). The combination of increased enrollments and increased federal support for research created a condition of panic hiring; institutions attempted to meet the growing demands by pressing every possible college teacher into service, frequently with little concern for proper degree credentials (Cartter, 1976, p. 11). College teaching became a rapidly upward mobile career.
Uncertainty marked higher education institutions during the early and mid-1950s as the United States became involved in the Cold War, academic freedom was attacked from the right, and enrollments slumped as all veteran groups as well as college-age population declined in numbers (Cartter, 1976; Henry, 1975). Within a few years an academic career became less desirable because of public opinion, low salaries, and fewer positions (Woodring, 1968).

Another reversal began in the late 1950s: Russia's launching of Sputnik in 1957 created a research boom in colleges and universities as America competed in science and engineering, primarily through the space program and defense projects (Froomkin, 1970). Federal expenditures continued to increase throughout the 1960s as higher education institutions began to be seen as leaders in both pure science and social science research to aid in solving technological and social problems (Anderson & Murray, 1971, p. 47). Federal contracts to agencies outside higher education institutions gave many academics further job opportunities, as well as adding to the increased number of available faculty positions: the greatest growth period occurred between 1961-62 and 1965-66 when enrollment increased by 45%, a growth which was anticipated by most to continue (Froomkin, 1970).

Examination of annotated bibliographies on publications of the 1950s and 1960s which related to college and university faculty...
members (Eells, 1962; Litton & Stickler, 1967) revealed a consistent concern with recruitment into the profession. Eckert and Stecklein (1958, 1961) obtained data in 1956 from 32 colleges and 700 college teachers about motivations for career choices, because "American colleges and universities face great problems in the coming decade, but none more serious than that of recruiting and holding top-quality staff" (Eckert & Stecklein, 1961, p. 1). Riesman (1959) discussed past patterns of recruitment into the academic profession and contrasted them with the late 1950s which he believed were "quite different. College faculties have been expanding too fast to permit the slow and careful grooming of a few hand-picked scholars" (Riesman, 1959, p. 269). Gustad (1960) studied data from 1,800 questionnaires and 300 personal interviews obtained from faculty members in 156 southern institutions in an attempt to determine why people chose to become college teachers and why some decided to leave teaching for other professions. Such career decision studies continued through the 1960s, based on the assumption that "swiftly mounting college enrollments have alerted even the lay citizen to the great shortage of faculty members" (Eckert & Neale, 1968, p. 71).

As Gordon (1974) noted, however, even during the 1960s a radically different concern began to be voiced:

Allan Cartter . . . began to predict the impending appearance of a surplus of PhD's back in the mid-1960s when other analysts were continuing to warn of shortages.
His estimate that an adverse job market for PhD's would first become evident about 1969 proved to be amazingly accurate. (pp. 12-13)

As the 1970s progressed, the evidence mounted that a surplus number of candidates for jobs—rather than recruitment into the profession—was a major concern for faculty members, caused by the "greatest overall and long-run rate of decline in its higher education growth patterns in all of its history" (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1975, p. 3). Cheit (1971, 1973) studied the financial condition of an illustrative sample of 41 institutions and determined that the difficulties he found were caused by five major elements: general inflation of the economy, the overall increases in faculty salaries, the substantial increases in amounts of student aid, campus disturbances, and the significant growth in institutional responsibility, activities, and aspirations. The increase of all these pressures, except for campus disturbances, indicated that financial plight continued to plague higher education institutions (The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, 1975; Henry, 1975). College presidents were asked in a 1974 survey (Glenny, Shea, Ruyle, & Freschi, 1976) if the decline in enrollment and funding influenced the number and type of faculty employed. From their point of view the effect was primarily positive: "Because of a large pool of well-qualified candidates, institutions are able to be selective in hiring faculty" (Glenny et al., 1976, p. 98), but some believed that faculty
"glut" was a short-term benefit which would become a liability in the long term (p. 100).

Projections for the Future

Projections for the future did not indicate a reversal in the trends of the 1970s. Radner and Miller (1975) provided statistical estimates of several aspects of demand and supply in higher education and in the area of academic demand for new PhDs concluded that there would be a marked low in demand in the mid-1980s. Cartter (1976) focussed his study on the academic labor market and made longer-range projections:

In the early 1980s . . . the gap between doctorates and academic openings jumps from approximately 20,000 annually to nearly 40,000, and the estimated excess of doctorates doubles. In the late 1980s, as doctorates begin to contract in the market-response models, and academic hiring picks up briefly from 1987 to 1989, the gap narrows, but only to open up again in the early 1990s. (1993 is likely to be another enrollment trough.) (p. 150)

Trivett (1977) summarized the current data on PhD placement and the projections of future conditions, because "despite the dialogue, doubt persists among some that there is a real present or prospective job shortage for PhDs" (p. 3). Using data from professional societies, the National Research Council, the Council of Graduate Schools, salaries, and first-job placement, he concluded that there was "a softening in the current market for PhDs, with
severe imbalances in specific fields" (Trivett, 1977, p. 4). From his analysis of projection data he asserted that "available job-market projections for PhDs portend a gloomier future" (p. 4).

The Present

These changes have affected virtually millions of students and thousands of faculty, yet the discussion and debate about the function of higher education, and thus the faculty required to fulfill that function, remains much the same as it was in the late 1880s. Liberal arts and special interest colleges cling to their traditional roles (Caplow & McGee, 1958; McGee, 1971), elite universities struggle to maintain their discipline orientation (Dressel & Faricy, 1972; Jencks & Riesman, 1969), and state-supported institutions strive to take on the trappings of the elite universities (Dunham, 1969; Hodgkinson, 1971). Their common denominator is the type of faculty person they say they seek to hire or wish to shape from existing faculty: a productive teacher-scholar. Hodgkinson (1971) analyzed U. S. Office of Education data and questionnaire responses from 1,230 presidents and concluded:

This set of statistics lends support for the idea that there is a monolithic status system in American higher education, and that its base is in research and in the "national reputation," both for the person and for the institution, that research . . . apparently can bring. (p. 17)

Earlier, Jencks and Riesman (1969) noted a rise in the national
university system and the continued appeal of the university-college model, and Woodring (1968) believed that attempts to emulate major universities dictated that other institutions increase their research and publication requirements. History has shown that when faculty positions were plentiful, such concerns were put aside temporarily by many institutions. When the number of positions decreased and the number of university graduates seeking positions increased, however, scholarship concerns became virtually paramount at all types of higher education institutions (Brubacher & Rudy, 1976; Ross, 1976). Cartter (1976) believed that "with constraints of feasible expenditure levels, colleges and universities use available resources to ensure institutional survival and to enhance their educational reputations" (p. 154), and it has become conventional wisdom that the most important factor in the reputation of an institution is the quality of its faculty.

The evidence of the past and the projections through the 1990s indicated that both competition and requirements for full-time faculty positions would continue to increase. Thus, both the faculty and institutions of higher education found themselves exactly where they had been throughout their history: in transition.
Higher Education: Informal Networks
As Part of the Hiring Process

The struggle to establish higher education as a legitimate institution performing professional duties was outlined above. The literature revealed, however, that the processes which surrounded the hiring of faculty to perform those duties were relatively shrouded from public disclosure and discussion. Perhaps this reflected the traditional view which Veblen (1918, 1957) held of faculty as high-minded, scholarly, and creative, and thus implicitly not inclined to be actively involved in such pragmatic concerns as employment.

Bledstein (1976) maintained that professional teachers used the institution of higher education to fulfill their middle-class ambition to establish themselves as professionals; the institution became a microcosm of middle-class America:

Careerism, competition, the standardization of rules and the organization of hierarchies, the obsession with expansion and growth, professionals seeking recognition and financial rewards for their efforts, administrators in the process of building empires: basically, both the values and the arrangements within American universities have changed little since 1900. (pp. 288-289)

Given careerism and competition as part of higher education's history, the question of how much weight was given to the various written and unwritten criteria at the actual point of hiring remained unanswered: The variables involved in human decision making and self-reports of the processes used seemed too complex, subtle, and
intertwined for either general or precise measurement and analysis.

The traditional view of the professional academic dictated a feigned lack of interest or eagerness about new positions, which precluded open competition. But competition was a reality, and thus the need was established for informal communication networks to function as interpersonal intermediaries for job market information (Brubacher & Rudy, 1976; Jencks & Riesman, 1969).

This study deals with such informal networks and their use in the hiring process. Brown's (1967) definition of informal and formal was used in the study:

"Formal" and "informal" intermediaries are dichotomized upon the primary relationships between the individual and the liaison. "Informal" refers to all those liaisons with which the individual has relationships which are not primarily for the purpose of finding a job. . . . "Formal" refers to all liaisons to which the individual relates for the explicit purpose of finding a job. (p. 117, footnote)

In addition, "informal networks," "informal methods," and "informal contacts" were considered synonyms and were used interchangeably throughout the study. A review was done of the literature which related informal networks and the hiring process and included subjective descriptions of the hiring process by higher education faculty and empirical studies done in higher education institutions.

How does the hiring process work? And where and how do informal networks fit into that process? One source of answers: subjective opinion or description by those within the higher education
system or, as Bennis (1973) labelled this approach, "personal knowledge as social science" (pp. 10-11).

Veblen (1918, 1957), brilliant as a student at Carleton, Johns Hopkins, and Yale, perhaps reflected the bitterness he developed during four decades of intermittent unemployment and rejection in higher education:

It lies in the nature of the case that this appointing power will tend to create a faculty after its own kind. It will be quick to recognize efficiency within the lines of its own interests, and slower to see fitness in those lines that lie outside of its horizon. (p. 108)

Examination of historical data from the late 1800s and early 1900s confirmed Veblen's view that administrators preferred to employ as faculty those men whom they knew personally and who agreed with them philosophically (Hofstadter & Smith, 1961; Ross, 1976). As Brubacher and Rudy (1976) said, "Historically, professors had served as hired hands for the old-time college president" (p. 303). Despite legislation of the 1960s which was intended, in part, to reduce the influence of any single administrator, Veblen's 1918 pessimism about the processes and outcomes of hiring continued over 50 years later to be voiced by academics such as Wagner (1976) who said, "Mediocre minds tend to pick other mediocre minds to teach beside their own; anyone who might rock the boat is avoided" (p. 218).

The literature of higher education during the 1920s and 1930s focussed primarily on institutional histories and institutional research.
(Dressel & Mayhew, 1974). In 1942, however, Wilson published *The Academic Man*, a sociological profile of professors which three decades later was still considered a "pioneering analysis of the academic profession" (Dressel & Pratt, 1971, p. 128), and remained "the only attempt at a comprehensive treatment of the academian in the institutional setting" (Anderson & Murray, 1971, p. 5). Using major universities as a basis for the study because "they wield the most influence" (Wilson, 1942, p. 6), Wilson analyzed faculty as part of a social system. In his discussion on placement of faculty he asserted that "the competition . . . is by no means completely open. The vast majority of qualified men are not in actual competition for the same openings, and some are not even potential competition" (p. 48). Contacts, whether through the degree-granting institution and departments or annual meetings, were considered the most opportune way to find first jobs or to change positions:

Yet it is only in exceptional cases that the fledgling PhD is left to fend for himself in obtaining a position, for institutional and departmental prestige must be upheld in the successful placement of their men. (p. 49)

Contacts are often made at annual meetings . . . which have come to be clearing houses for the older men and "slave markets" for hopeful graduate students. . . . Since convention seems to require the advancement of a candidate's interest by a third party, knowing the "right people" is exceedingly important. (pp. 49-50)

Although the candidate with a high record and unqualified recommendations from competent judges stands a better chance than the less meritorious, between eligible
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individuals of apparently equal ability and training, preference is always shown for "connections." (p. 51)

Wilson's (1942) identification of contacts, i.e., informal networks, as one of the most significant determining factors in job placement became conventional wisdom during the next four decades. Descriptions of the phenomenon varied from the matter-of-fact to cynicism. Friedberg and Hawes (1965) said simply, "It's not what you know, it's who you know" (p. 64), while Jencks and Riesman (1969) maintained that, as a result of the national proliferation of discipline-oriented PhDs, "an informal national system of job placement and replacement has come into existence" (p. 14). Van den Berghe (1970), whose view of the professor's life was reflected in his book's title, Academic Gamesmanship, supported the contact hypothesis:

Early in one's career they [offers] have to be solicited by canvassing one's old professors and classmates in graduate school. Another source of offers are hand-me-downs from better established colleagues who, in declining offers, drop your name as a likely "movable." (p. 64)

All of these writers also concurred with Wilson's 1942 assertion that "slave markets" were an acknowledged method used in the academic job search. Morreale (1972), however, rather bitterly dissented in his view of the hiring process:

These meetings have been known as slave markets, but in reality they are more in keeping with the free enterprise-capitalist spirit that reigns here; they are shape-ups. . . . The good jobs are awarded long before the
annual shape-up. They are distributed as sinecures by the professors of graduate schools in the quiet of their offices; lesser jobs, but still good jobs, are shuffled among the graduate school grapevine and what is left over is put up for contract to the intellectual longshoremen. (p. 94)

The hiring processes were believed by some to be changing during the 1960s. Although Millett (1961) agreed that "a generation or more ago, the placing of candidates was a very personal and informal procedure" (p. 85), he maintained that the growing size of both graduate schools and higher education institutions precluded the exclusive use of these methods and he emphasized the increased use of university and convention placement bureaus. Wilson (1967) re-examined his propositions of 1942 and found the former situation of "slave markets" and excessive doctorates "today completely reversed" (p. 100). He described the seller's market of the 1960s and concluded that "the problem of most graduate schools today is that of increasing their production rather than that of finding jobs for those who have been highly trained" (p. 100). He reflected the general tendency of the academic world during that period to fail to use existing data to make accurate projections about available positions and to recognize that shortages already had begun in several fields (Cartter & Farrell, 1969).

The conventional wisdom which remained constant and had consensus was that there was an "obsession with contacts" (Anderson
Murray, 1971, p. 16) in the higher education hiring process. Livesey (1975) both judged and described the hiring process from the employing institution's point of view:

The "old boy" method of recruitment and hiring has prevailed too long. Chairmen with job openings call their old graduate professors for recommendations, or acquaintances from academic conventions, or former classmates now teaching at other colleges, or just plain drinking buddies. (p. 311)

Part of the conventional wisdom in higher education, according to most male writers before the mid-1970s, was that women were, at the very most, a peripheral concern. This was a world of men, in the sense of gender, not man, in the generic sense of either men or women. Wilson (1942) discussed women only when including them among the reasons for low faculty salaries:

Average salaries are also depressed by the fact that there is a higher percentage (about 25 percent) of women workers than in any other major profession. It is a practice in our society to pay women less than men for the same work, so that the entrance of women in large numbers as competitors is always both a cause and a result of low wages in an occupation. (p. 137)

Woodburne (1950) maintained that women's colleges had, in the past, been the only employment hope for women doctorates, but the situation was changing: "A number of universities are discussing the desirability, in view of their coeducational function, of adding able women to their staffs" (p. 57).

Despite these discussions and the continued hiring of women,
primarily at less prestigious institutions and at lower ranks (Centra, 1974), the general attitude toward women in higher education remained unchanged, as noted by Anderson and Murray (1971):

If women, these teachers at the rank and file colleges may well have been victims of the rather substantial discrimination which is so often directed against prospective female teachers by chauvinistic male administrators in the colleges and universities. . . . With increasing competition with male graduate students expected during the 1970s for a limited number of teaching openings, it is likely even at these schools that women will be experiencing increasing difficulty in securing a job. (p. 10)

Two major factors, however, brought about a change in the general overlooking of women in the literature and discussions about higher education: (a) Women began providing evidence of past discrimination and answered arguments accusing them of nonprofessionalism (Abramson, 1975; Astin, 1969; Furniss & Graham, 1974; Howe, 1975; Kane, 1976; Richardson, 1974; Rossi & Calderwood, 1973; Theodore, 1971), and (b) the legislation was enacted which became known collectively as affirmative action (see The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, 1973, pp. 127-151).

The evidence and the legislation did not necessarily change either the attitudes or practices in higher education. More male researchers included women in their examinations of higher education: Fulton (1975), Lewis (1975), and Livesey (1975) cited numerous studies which indicated: "Universities will continue to take advantage of women until such discrimination becomes too costly" (Fulton,
p. 246); "Females, regardless of their capacity, have a more difficult time than males in finding an academic position" (Lewis, p. 128); and "College teaching is perhaps the most discriminatory field of all, and the pace of rectification is painfully slow. . . . The result is that potential female professors don't receive the same exposure to job opportunities as men. They have to settle" (Livesey, pp. 311-312).

Centra (1974) studied a matched sample of 3,658 men and women who had earned doctorates in 1950, 1960, and 1968; one of his findings was an indication of a backlash against women, especially in the 1968 males, which led him to conclude:

In a tight job market, men may be less concerned about increasing women's opportunities and more concerned with their own security. If this is so, then men who are currently entering the job market may be even less involved or sympathetic. (p. 144)

Empirical data on the use of informal networks during the hiring process in higher education are limited. Brown's (1965a, 1965b, 1967) works were believed the definitive studies of how American academics moved on the labor market (Lewis, 1975; McGee, 1971). A handful of other major studies which included data on informal networks (Caplow & McGee, 1958; Marshall, 1964; McGee, 1971) also were conducted during the greatest growth period of American higher education and are reviewed in detail below.

Two studies conducted before the late 1950s and the 1960s provided information relevant to higher education hiring processes and
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informal networks: Hollingshead (1938) examined the relationship between ingroup membership and academic selection, which came to be called inbreeding, and Woodburne (1950) examined faculty personnel policies.

Hollingshead (1938) studied all appointments at Indiana University between 1885 and 1937 and found that 43% were alumni and 20% had family members on the staff. He contention that membership in alumni, friendship, and family groups accounted for at least four-fifths of all appointments and that "only a small minority may be attributed to professional competition, i.e., the selection has been largely social rather than competitive" (p. 831). The explanation for these findings was that inbreeding principles "are, perhaps, as old as institutions; certainly they are fundamental in any harmonious organization" (p. 833). Several studies during the last 40 years examined the effect of inbreeding practices on faculty after their appointments (Hollinghead, 1940; Lewis, 1966), but few focused on the extent inbreeding contributed to noncompetition in hiring practices. Berelson (1960) briefly discussed inbreeding, defined as highest earned degree from one's hiring institution, in his study of graduate education. He found that institutions at the highest prestige level had the highest rate of academic inbreeding, but did not believe it was negative: "As a class, they have had to in-breed, as a statistical consequence of their dominant position as producers. Across
the system as a whole—if such a figure makes any sense—the proportion of in-bred faculty is about 15%" (p. 116). The 1969 Carnegie Commission Survey of Faculty and Student Opinion collected statistics from 200,000 faculty, graduate students, and undergraduates, which included data on "true self-recruitment—that is, the appointment of faculty to the actual institution from which they obtained their doctorate" (Trow, 1975, footnote, p. 5). However, presentation and analysis of these data, as well as "the whole question of educational careers and recruitment" (Trow, 1975, footnote, p. 5), was intended for a future publication, one which has never appeared.¹

Thus, Lewis (1975) acknowledged that the true amount of inbreeding activity in higher education institutions was unknown and asserted that Hollinghead's findings were "still important because they were the first to substantiate the fact that considerations other than purely professional ones play more than only a minor role in recruitment" (p. 111).

Woodburne (1950) interviewed between four and seven persons at 46 institutions, including a cross-section of universities, state colleges, and liberal arts colleges, in an attempt to determine the policies and practices of appointments and promotions in higher

¹An abstract of this intended publication, The American Academics, by the authors, Oliver Fulton and Martin Trow, appeared in Sponsored Research of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education (1975, pp. 42-46).
education. The major finding related to the search processes used by institutions to fill a faculty position was that the process remained as it had been for several decades: "Almost without exception, the customary procedure is to ask for suggestions from scholars who are well known in the field of study and who have trained a number of doctoral candidates" (p. 2).

Brown (1967) summarized the findings of 13 studies which included data on formal and informal methods of finding jobs in the academic labor market (pp. 122-123). This researcher removed data from the three major studies (Brown, 1965b, 1967; Marshall, 1964) included in the summary and examined the table summary of the remaining 10 studies, all relatively small in scope. The studies were conducted during 1926-27, 1927-28, 1936-37, 1946, 1956-57, 1958-63, 1960, 1961, 1962-63, and 1964-65; the number of studies increased as issues of institutional growth and faculty mobility grew in importance. Samples were drawn from a cross-section of institutions, i.e., junior colleges, North Central Association Colleges, and seven New England colleges, and several academic groups, e.g., economists and psychologists. Despite the 40-year span in the dates of the studies and the wide differences in sampling and methodology, the findings were similar: All 10 studies reported use of informal methods in finding jobs with 51% the mean, 44% the median, and a range from 25% to 83%. Nine of the 10 studies included categories
of informal methods used and "professional acquaintance" was the most frequently cited: All nine studies reported 21% or more job seekers used this method; the mean use was 26%, the median use was 25%, and the range 21% to 37%.

Caplow and McGee (1958) conducted a study of the processes surrounding vacancies and replacements of faculty at nine major universities during the academic years 1954-55 and 1955-56. They interviewed 215 chairmen of departments where a vacancy occurred and one faculty peer for each vacancy (162). The open-ended questions related to the person leaving, the position vacated, the search, and the replacement. The following conclusions were most relevant to the present study: (a) Open hiring was defined as competitive, closed hiring was preferential: "In theory, academic recruitment is mostly open. In practice, it is mostly closed" (p. 109). (b) The extent of closed hiring was that 40% of the instructors and assistant professors and 61% of the associate and full professors who were replacements had contact with the hiring department before their candidacy (p. 132). (c) Prestige was identified as a central variable in recruitment, but prestige was subjective, based on others' personal opinions and the candidates' compatibility; publications submitted as credentials were rarely read (pp. 116-133). (d) Women were discriminated against "not because they have low prestige but because they are outside the prestige system" (p. 111). (e) A
selectivity existed about who received job information (p. 106) with little reliable information available to the candidates without contacts of friends and acquaintances (pp. 111, 229): "Departments are apt to prefer anyone who is at all familiar to someone who is totally unknown" (p. 133).

McGee (1971) used a methodology and sample somewhat similar to the 1958 Caplow and McGee study: During 1966-67 he conducted open-ended interviews with 125 market actives, i.e., those asked to submit credentials or interview, and a control group of inactives, i.e., those who reported no job activity, at 11 private liberal arts colleges in the Upper Midwest. Although his study was of the supply, i.e., faculty, rather than demand, i.e., hiring institution, the findings related to the present study were substantially the same as the 1958 study. (a) Prestige was acquired through professional reputation, usually acquired by publications, but "has as important subcomponents the possession of the right connections" (p. 29), and "the significance of a wide professional reputation is obvious: The more widely a man is known as a desirable acquisition, as a good man in his field, the more easily he can set in motion a network of contacts for job seeking" (p. 29). (b) Even though the data were collected in expansion years, there was relatively little mobility, i.e., only 12% of the actives had actually changed positions (p. 94). (c) "The more professionally active a man is, the more visible he
becomes and the more likely he is to receive probes" (p. 109).

(d) Sixty-four percent of the probes or first contacts about potential employment could be classified as informal, i.e., inquiry from acquaintances (15%), indirect, through intermediary (20%), former employment or former study at hiring institution (11%), or occurred in course of some face-to-face professional or social interaction (18%) (p. 110). McGee commented about the reason for these findings:

Informal friendship networks and grapevines of this nature are a well-known characteristic of academics, and since job information is of vital importance in any occupational system and the transmission of it is very badly institutionalized or regulated in academics, it is not surprising that informal systems play a role in transmitting it. (p. 112)

(e) Informal communication systems played a central role in the hiring process because formal methods, e.g., advertisements, placement agencies, did not provide the information of most concern to the hiring institution, i.e., the candidate's compatibility and "potential for adding luster to the department image through disciplinary prestige" (p. 115). Again McGee (1971) concluded:

The kinds of information that can be elicited by formal means, means open to all candidates, are relatively useless in the hiring process. What departments really need to know about potential candidates can be known best only about persons with whom the hiring agents are already acquainted or, at the last useful remove, only those persons whose judgements the agents are capable of evaluating, that is, through friends or acquaintances who know the candidate. (p. 115)
Some prior acquaintance within the hiring institution was reported by 69% of the sample who received probes, and 45% reported that the probes were initiated by acquaintances at the hiring institution. "The principal reason many men receive probes is simply that they are quantities known to the probers and thus preferable to quantities unknown" (p. 117). Thus, McGee found evidence that informal networks operated during the hiring process, and he concluded that their use was both widespread and acceptable.

Marshall (1964) used mail questionnaires to obtain data from both the demand and supply sides of the higher education labor market: 920 chairmen of chemistry, English, and economics from 50 states (demand) and 420 economists on higher education faculties (supply). The chairmen identified the degree to which they used several methods of recruitment, although little distinction was made between formal and informal methods. Thus, although letters of application sent to the department chairman were used by 425 departments in selection of candidates, it was not indicated whether these were from known or unknown candidates. The mixture of informal and formal also was found in the requests to the "chairmen of graduate schools and university vocational bureaus" (p. 78), used regularly by 531 departments as a recruitment method. Marshall noted that "recruitment directly from the graduate schools works best when the departmental chairman (or another member) has close personal
contacts in the graduate departments" (p. 79), but the extent to which this occurred was not indicated. In general, however, he concluded from his data on the demand side of the academic job market that "heavy reliance is still placed on the more informal and casual means of securing personnel: this was true for all three of the disciplines" (p. 83); included were informal contacts at annual meetings and word-of-mouth.

Marshall (1964) found on the supply side of higher education "many of the same channels of employment consistently used" (p. 85). A secondary analysis of data found in Table 4-5, "Method of Securing Last Job" (p. 85), was done by the researcher by labelling each of the 12 methods as informal or formal. Thus, of the 420 economists responding, 332 (79%) had used an informal method and 88 (21%) had used a formal method in obtaining their last job. The three most frequently used informal methods were "friends" (105, 25%), "informal contacts at annual meetings" (97, 23%), and "chairman of graduate department" (79, 19%). The most frequently used formal method was "letter of application" (36, 9%). Marshall concluded that "the patterns of recruitment and selection of candidates are a strange combination of meticulous care and painstaking effort with heavy reliance on casual and informal methods" (p. 130). In his recommendations, however, he noted:

The recommendations of friends whose endorsements can
be trusted are likely to remain an important factor in the operation of the academic labor market. One can only hope that this method will in the future be employed more judiciously and with less exclusion to other methods. With the growing size of the faculty population, the happy state where everyone knew a wide proportion of those in his discipline will end. Reliance on the recommendations of friends will provide too narrow a scope to the market. (pp. 133-134)

Brown's studies of the academic labor market were conducted during expansion years (1962-1964) and were done under the assumption that the critical shortages of faculty would continue through the 1970s. His first study, done in 1962 and published in 1965 (1965b), used data obtained from interviews with 103 social scientists hired between 1955-56 and 1962 at 18 major Southeastern universities and with 50 social science department chairmen at the same institutions. It was considered a pilot project for his next study when he used a mail questionnaire with a stratified sample selected from all faculty who had been newly hired for 1964-65 and received 7,500 responses (74% response rate). The results from the second study were first published in 1965 (1965a) under a government contract, with a condensed and rewritten version published in 1967. Data reported here were taken from the 1967 report because, while the general findings of the pilot project (1965b) were similar, the second study used a stratified sample so that results were generalizable. In addition, the government contract version of the second study (1965a) placed more emphasis on economic theory.
Brown's data indicated that 65% of the newly hired faculty found their jobs through informal contacts: personal friends and professional acquaintances accounted for 18% and undergraduate and graduate school professors, 15%. In this expansion period, 26% did nothing and were recruited. Graduate professors who also were thesis advisors were used in the search by 40% of the candidates. "Blind letters" led the formal methods (19%) by which faculty had found their new positions, although 46% had used blind letters in their job searches. College placement offices were used in the job search by 36%, but only 6% had found their jobs through such offices (1967, p. 119).

Brown also obtained evaluations of the informal and formal market intermediaries using criteria of frequency, efficiency, desirability, and importance. From the data on desirability of method he concluded:

Informal methods produce much better jobs than formal methods. The five first-ranking methods are informal. A higher percentage of the jobs found by informal methods tends to be accepted. Though formal methods tend to produce large number of leads, the best offers result from the jobs found through contemporaries and former professors. (p. 141)

This supported his earlier conclusion that "formal methods are used only after informal contacts have failed to yield a good job" (p. 117).

Based on his findings, Brown made a wide range of recommendations, proposing that various mechanisms be established to increase
job information for a better match between supply and demand.

Throughout, however, he acknowledged the importance of informal networks:

The academic labor market is still primarily an informal one. . . . The predominance of grapevine placement suggests that the maintenance of informal contacts is extremely important. (p. 180)

The importance of nurturing friendships and acquaintances as channels to knowledge about job opportunities should also be appreciated. Responding to this knowledge, individuals should strive to develop professional contacts and to maintain them. (p. 187)

And, as a last recommendation, Brown said, "Women should not be discouraged from pursuing careers in college teaching," although "on the average, women are not as qualified and as committed to an academic career as are men" (p. 187).

Conceptual Framework

Informal and formal methods used in the hiring process in higher education were conceptualized as parallel to several other two-dimensional models of social mobility. The primary model used in this study was described by Turner (1960) as "contest" and "sponsored" mobility:

Contest mobility is like a sporting event in which many compete for a few recognized prizes. The contest is judged to be fair only if all the players compete on an equal footing. Victory must be won solely by one's own efforts. . . . Sponsored mobility, on the other hand, rejects the pattern of the contest and substitutes a
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controlled selection process. In this process the elite or their agents, who are best qualified to judge merit, call those individuals who have the appropriate qualities. Individuals do not win or seize elite status, but mobility is rather a process of sponsored induction into the elite following selection. (p. 857)

The parallel would be that informal methods in the hiring process represent sponsored mobility and formal methods, contest mobility: the former implies some personal relationship(s) established before the hiring process begins which influence that process; the latter suggests that hiring is done without influence from or recognition of any such relationships, thus giving all candidates of equal qualifications and ability equal consideration.

This same parallel could be applied to Parsons' (1952) concepts of universalistic-achievement (formal) and particularistic-ascription (informal). Parsons commented on one of the adaptive mechanisms used with universalistic criteria:

A second adaptive context which may be mentioned is that concerned with the difficulty of implementing genuinely universalistic criteria of judgment of performance-qualities and achievements, so that the individual is put in the right place and his rewards are nicely proportioned to his actual achievements. In this sphere we find institutional patterns which seem directly to contravene the principles which would be deduced from the dominant value-orientation pattern. . . . These may be treated as adaptive structures which have the function of mitigating the structured strains inherent in the exposure of people to competitive pressures where detailed universalistic discriminations are impracticable. (p. 185)

Lewis (1975) focussed on Parsons' concept of particularistic criteria:
This and the following chapter focus on the extent to which extra-academic elements, many of a subjective and particularistic nature, are injected into a facet of academic life where it is said they are largely ignored, namely, the process of selecting faculty for academic positions. (p. 49)

He reviewed previous studies of "the appointment process," and concluded that ascriptive, i.e., particularistic, criteria were extremely influential (see Lewis, 1975, Chapter 5, pp. 109-146).

Thus, this study of informal networks functioning in the higher education hiring process used a conceptual framework of informal methods representing sponsored mobility, as well as particularistic and ascriptive criteria, and formal methods representing contest mobility, as well as universalistic and achievement criteria. Conventional wisdom identifies these as closed (informal) versus open (formal) systems.

Hypotheses of the Study

**HYPOTHESIS ONE:** Informal contacts have been used more than formal methods in the higher education hiring process.

**HYPOTHESIS TWO:** Faculty will indicate they would use informal contacts more than formal methods in searching for another academic position.

**HYPOTHESIS THREE:** Faculty believe informal contacts have the same or greater influence on the hiring process now than in the...
past.

HYPOTHESIS FOUR: Faculty hired during the tightening job market have used informal networks in the higher education hiring process more than faculty hired during the expansion period.

HYPOTHESIS FIVE: Women faculty have used informal networks in the higher education hiring process less than men faculty.

HYPOTHESIS SIX: Faculty hired during the tightening job market have been the recipients of inbreeding activity in the higher education hiring process less than faculty hired during the expansion period.

HYPOTHESIS SEVEN: Faculty with high professional activity have been more active as links in the informal network than faculty with low professional activity.

HYPOTHESIS EIGHT: Faculty with high professional activity and high activity as links in the informal network have been more active in the academic job market than faculty with low professional activity and no activity as links in the informal network.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this chapter is to describe how the study was done. Included are the sampling procedure, the design, instrumentation, data collection procedure, a description of the sample, and the data analysis plan.

Sampling Procedure

Full-time higher education faculty employed by a public university were identified as the population of interest. A public university was chosen because, as Harris (1972) predicted, public institutions account for more than 80% of higher education enrollment. However, researchers concerned with attitudes and behaviors of faculty had more frequently concentrated on the ideal or elite colleges and universities, which helped give rise to Dunham's (1969) title for his study of colleges and universities: Colleges of the Forgotten Americans. The specific public university chosen as the setting for this study was among those studied by Dunham and was judged by him to have made a successful transition from a single to a multipurpose institution. Hodgkinson (1971) described this transition as "upward mobility...clearly the conventional and
most widely followed path" (pp. 48-49). This public university had begun as a normal school to train schoolteachers for a specific region of a midwestern state; after a two-year program, graduates were issued a teaching certificate. It added bachelors' degrees in 1918 and masters' degrees were begun in 1939. A number of programs had offered specialists' degrees since 1960 and doctorates since 1966. Thus, the faculty population chosen for the study represented the largest faculty group in higher education, i.e., employed by a public institution which had expanded its goals, degrees, and programs over an extended time period.

The definition of faculty used in this study included the following criteria: (a) at the time of the study was designated as a full-time faculty member, (b) held rank, excluding adjunct, and (c) assigned administrative duties were secondary to teaching duties. Thus, even if central office administrators, deans, and department chairs held rank, and/or taught one class, and/or had been hired as faculty members, they were not considered faculty for this study. The criteria for the definition of faculty were chosen so that the population would be composed of those whose primary career emphasis was full-time teaching in higher education.

A sampling frame was needed which met the three criteria and also included faculty members' sex and the date and month they were hired. Sex and date of hiring were necessary for stratification of
the population into subgroups before the sample was chosen. Sex stratification was to ensure a sufficient proportion of females for hypothesis testing. Date-hired stratification was to ensure that the sample would supply longitudinal data so that comparisons could be made between those hired during the tightening job market and those hired during the expansion years. A list which met all the above criteria was obtained from the office of the union which represented the faculty in collective bargaining; it was entitled "_____ Bargaining Unit List," was dated "9 February 1978," and contained employment data on 869 full-time faculty members.

The first data compiled from the list of faculty members consisted of a hand tally of the year each faculty member was hired at this institution (see Figure 1). Neither the traditional academic year, i.e., September through April, nor fiscal year, i.e., July 1 through June 30, was used. Instead, May of one calendar year through April of the next calendar year was used with the assumption that most hiring of full-time faculty done through April of any given year was to meet instructional needs of that academic year and hiring done between May and August was for projected instructional needs of the following academic year (September-April). Thus, those faculty hired between May and August were counted within the next academic year.

The data in Figure 1 indicate the year that current full-time
Figure 1. Number of current full-time instructional staff hired between 1935 and 1978. (Month hired was May through December of first year in column category or January through April of second year in column category. Data compiled from separate entries on faculty union's bargaining list, dated "7 February 1978.")
faculty members were hired, not the total number who were actually hired in any given year. Because exact hiring figures which met the criteria for definition of faculty were not available, these figures could be viewed as only an approximation of the actual number hired. Even with that limitation, these figures reflected the general higher education hiring patterns. There was a sharp increase in the middle 1950s which had slight fluctuations for five years before another sharp increase in 1960-61. The 1960s saw the greatest expansion with 1966-67 the peak expansion year. After an increase in hiring in 1970-71, the numbers dropped and stayed down for six years. The figures indicated, however, that another sharp increase in hiring took place in the nine months prior to this study (May 1977 through January 1978).

The population was stratified by the variable of date hired into three groups: Group 1 was hired between May 1971 and February 1978 and represented the tightening job market in higher education; Group 2 was hired between May 1961 and April 1971, and with Group 3, hired between 1935 and April 1961, represented the expanding job market in higher education. A stratification of each of these three groups was done by the variable of sex, which resulted in the population numbers in the six groups presented in Table 1.

Data in Table 1 indicate that of the current 869 full-time faculty members 246 were hired in the last eight years, 461 during the
greatest expansion decade, and 162 had been at this institution between 17 and 43 years. The percentage of current female faculty increased from 16% to 30%, indicating that the proportion of women hired increased over the years, while the percentage of females in the total faculty population was 23%.

Table 1
Total Population Stratified by Sex and Date Hired

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lists of all faculty who were either on leaves of absence or sabbatical leaves at the time of the study were obtained from the university's appropriate central administrative office. Fifty-three faculty were on leave and these names were deleted from the stratified subgroups, which resulted in the adjusted population totals presented in Table 2.

Four criteria were used to determine the number in the sample
size and the number in the stratified variables by separate variable and by combined classifications of stratified variables: (a) need to have the proportion of males and females in the total sample equivalent to their proportion in the population, (b) need to have the proportion of time-hired groups in the total sample equivalent to their proportion in the population, (c) need to have sufficient numbers in each classification total within stratified variables for hypothesis testing, and (d) need to have sufficient numbers in combined stratified subgroups for hypothesis testing.

Table 2

Adjusted Population Stratified by Sex and Date Hired

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Hired</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group 1</strong> (5/71-2/78)</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>628</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group 2</strong> (5/61-4/71)</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>679</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group 3</strong> (8/35-4/61)</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>628</td>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The adjusted population figures came from deletions of faculty on leaves of absence (21) and sabbaticals (32) at time of study.
Application of these criteria resulted in the sample size, stratified by sex and date hired, presented in Table 3. The total sample size of 82 represented a ten-to-one ratio of population (816) to sample and was chosen because it was a realistic number for the data collection method, yet met the criterion of sufficient numbers in each stratified variables' classification for hypothesis testing when the criterion of population proportions equivalent to total sample proportions on the variables of sex and date hired was applied. This resulted in a sample of 19 (23%) females and 63 (77%) males divided into date-hired groups, with Group 1's population proportion of 29% (239 of 816) equivalent to 24 faculty in the sample of 82, Group 2's population proportion of 51% (420 of 816) equivalent to 42 faculty, and Group 3's population proportion of 19% (157 of 816) equivalent to 15 and extended by 1 to 16 (20%). A ten-to-one ratio also was applied to the totals within the stratified population subgroups to determine the sample number within each subgroup. The results were sample sizes by sex which represented their actual numbers in the date-hired groups' population. They also were nearly identical to the subgroup sample sizes which would have resulted if the population and sample proportions for the sex variable (males = 77% and females = 23%) had been applied: Group 1 (24: males 18, females 6); Group 2 (42: males 32, females 10); and Group 3 (16: males 12, females 4).
### Table 3

Sample Size Stratified by Sex and Date Hired

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A table of random digit numbers was used to choose the stratified random sample. Two additions were made to the sample numbers in each of the six subgroups: (a) Two numbers were added to each subgroup for the purpose of pretesting, and (b) 25% of each subgroup total was added sequentially to that group for the purpose of replacing those in the sample whom the researcher might not have been able to contact or those who might have chosen not to participate in the study. For example, in the subgroup "Group 1, Male," 167 was the population size and 17 the sample size; from the table of random digits, the first 17 random digits which equalled 167 or less were listed sequentially; two additional digits were added for selecting the pretest sample; and four (25% of 17) additional digits were
added sequentially for replacement purposes. All names from the sampling frame list were within one of the six subgroups and each name had been assigned a number using numbers 1 through the total number of the subgroup in the population. Those names with the numbers chosen from a table of random digit numbers comprised the stratified random sample, the pretest sample, and a list of sequential replacements for each subgroup.

A decision was made after conducting a pretest with one person from each subgroup to include all 12 names selected for the pretest with the sample of 82. The decision was based on the fact that the interview schedule content and procedures for data gathering were going to be the same for the entire study, i.e., the pretest did not reveal major flaws in either the questions or the procedures. Thus, it was necessary to go back to the sample list for each subgroup and use a table of random numbers to choose the first two numbers which were equal to or less than the total in the sample subgroups. The random numbers chosen within each subgroup indicated which of the sequentially numbered names should be removed; the first number and name became the first replacement and the second number and name became the second replacement.

The sampling procedure outlined above was believed to result in a sample of respondents whose data could be taken to represent the faculty population from which they were selected.
Design, Instrumentation, and Data Collection Procedure

The design determined to be most appropriate for testing the hypotheses of this study was to conduct a survey through personal interviews at one point in time with a stratified random sample of full-time higher education faculty members at one public university. A survey through personal interviews conducted by the researcher, rather than a questionnaire, was chosen for two reasons:

1. The content of the hypotheses and the main dependent variable, informal networks, required data which came from personal history, present beliefs, and general perceptions about a generally private topic; the researcher believed that personal interviews would elicit more reliable data because respondents' answers could be followed up by using specific questioning strategies such as probing, asking for examples, and asking for clarification of responses. It also gave the subjects an opportunity to ask for clarification if questions were unclear to them.

2. A higher response rate with more complete data was anticipated through the use of personal interviews. It was believed that faculty received numerous questionnaires and would more likely reject them outright, put off completing them, or fail to complete all items.

Thus, the design represented a compromise between greater
numbers in the sample, which would have been possible with a question-naire, and the more detailed profile of each subject on the vari-
able under study in a smaller sample through use of personal inter-
views. The interviews also ensured that subjects' responses were as
complete as possible, thus reducing the probability of missing data
which would have affected the descriptive and comparative analyses
of the data.

The design also included conducting preliminary interviews
with several friends who were higher education faculty members not
employed at the institution where the study was conducted. This was
done to test the clarity and logical flow of items on the interview
schedule. A pretest also was included in the design with two subjects
selected from each subgroup and interviewed using the procedure pro-
posed for the entire data-gathering.

The design implementation began with choosing the stratified
random sample as outlined earlier in this chapter. Next, the
researcher constructed an interview schedule when it was determined
that none was available which dealt primarily with informal networks.
Interview schedules and questionnaires were examined from previous
studies which dealt with higher education faculty mobility; special
attention was paid to items which related to job searches and informa-
tion sources for job openings. The primary questionnaires studies
were those used by Astin (1969), Brown (1965b, 1967), Centra (1974),
Marshall (1964), Trow (1975), and Williams, Blackstone, and Metcalf (1974). Interview schedules examined included those used by Caplow and McGee (1958) and McGee (1971). Although Wilson's 1942 study was primarily descriptive and did not include specific data-gathering instruments, the organization of his discussion indicated the type of questions and/or observations on which he based his conclusions.

The study of higher education social scientists conducted by Lazarsfeld and Thielens (1958) provided a beginning framework for construction of a professional activity index required for hypothesis testing. Although they chose to use publications as the primary indicator of professional activity, the researcher believed the independent variable of professional activity was too narrow when determined only by publications, and other criteria which were discussed in Brown (1965b, 1967), Caplow and McGee (1958), and McGee (1971) were considered. Several different versions of the index were developed and each version used with sample vitae to determine its efficiency in gathering sufficient data to allow for construction of a professional activity index. The series of items which were included in the data-gathering instrument had been used to analyze 10 sample vitae and the items were believed to elicit sufficient data to construct a professional activity index.

Some interview schedule items were rewritten to reduce
ambiguity of meaning when, following the research design, preliminary interviews were conducted with friends who were higher education faculty not at the institution where the study was conducted. The sequence of questions was also changed so that the open-ended and professional activity questions were at the end of the interview, with the rationale that rapport was likely to be greater then than at the beginning of the interview, thus eliciting more complete and accurate data. All items with the exception of demographic data were potentially open-ended. The respondent was not to see the items or the response categories; the latter were the researcher's best estimate from previous literature of the possible range of responses. The intent of the language of the questions was that subjects were not cued into specific topics: the phrase "informal network" was not used in any question and also was not used in any probing questions following initial responses. Thus, the final schedule (see Appendix A) provided data needed to describe the sample and data on all independent and dependent variables to test the hypotheses.

The procedure for actual data collection began with creating an identification cross-reference card to be used for each name randomly chosen for the sample, the pretest, and replacement. This card (see Appendix D) included space for name, interview number, office location, office hours, office phone number, date of first and second
contact, date and time of interview appointment, when interview was completed or refused, length of interview, availability of vita, and comments. The cross-reference cards were sorted according to office location for easier identification of all those in one building or one complex of buildings.

Each person's office hours were determined by a visit to the office location by the researcher; faculty normally posted schedules at their office location. The researcher would then return to the office area during the subject's posted office hours. It was determined that if no contact had been made after five personal visits to the office area, the subject would be called by the researcher. If calls also proved unsuccessful after five attempts, a letter would be written introducing the researcher, explaining the project, and requesting an interview appointment.

A standard introduction was developed by the researcher as the approach to the subject when personal contact had been made: "Are you ______? I am Barbara Mills, a doctoral candidate from __________ University's College of Education. For part of my doctoral requirements, I am doing a study of the academic labor market in higher education. I have drawn a sample from the faculty here and you are part of my sample. I would like to make an appointment with you for a personal interview of approximately 30 to 45 minutes. Your identity will remain confidential and known only to myself."
At that point an interview time was negotiated.

Each interview was begun by restating the general topic, the academic labor market in higher education. All subjects were again assured that individual responses would be known only to the interviewer; they would not be identified by name or department on the interview schedule during the data analysis. If the subjects asked questions about the hypotheses of the study before or during the interview, the researcher stated that she preferred not to discuss them to prevent bias in responses.

All subjects were encouraged to include in their responses any comments which they believed were relevant to the question. All questions were asked in the same way to all subjects as much as possible; the questions were memorized verbatim by the researcher to increase the possibility of eye contact and establish the atmosphere of a conversation. When the interview came to the last question, related to professional activities, subjects were asked if they would prefer answering each of the questions or if a vita were available for examination. If the latter option was taken, the vita was used in the office or an adjoining area and returned immediately to the subject, with some exceptions. Eight subjects preferred to have the researcher take the vita, primarily because the length of the interview had run into other commitments they had made. A member of the Educational Leadership's Human Subjects Committee had approved the
researcher's data-gathering plan with the stipulation that any vita removed from an office area should be initialled by the subject; this precaution was taken with these subjects.

Sample Description

Interviews with the pretest sample were begun on March 20, 1978. After the decision to include all 12 subjects from the pretest sample as part of the sample of 82, adjustments in the sampling lists were made as described earlier in the chapter. Five weeks later, at the end of the winter term (April 21, 1978), 76 subjects (93% of the sample) had been interviewed. The remaining six were contacted and interviewed during the six-week spring term. Thus, the sample response rate was 100%, i.e., everyone who was contacted agreed to be and was interviewed. One person in the sample was replaced after the first contact with an office secretary indicated that the subject was on personal leave without pay for medical reasons.

As originally planned, face-to-face contact was the primary approach of the researcher to the subject (89% or 73 of the subjects). The phone call as a first contact method was needed in 11% (9) of the cases; use of letters was not necessary. In 33% (27) of the cases, interviews were held at the time of the first contact; the remaining 67% (55) made appointments for a future time, and only one interview had to be rescheduled.
The total time spent in actual interviewing was 59 hours. The average interview length was 43 minutes with a range of 75 (15 to 90) minutes. This variability was partially explained by whether professional activity data were provided by verbal responses or from a vita; the time the researcher spent taking data from a vita following the verbal interview was not included in noting the length of the interview. Interviews with female faculty averaged 37 minutes with a range of 35 (20 to 55) minutes, while interviews with males averaged 45 minutes with a range of 75 (15 to 90) minutes. Lengths of interviews also were averaged by current academic rank: lecturer—30 minutes, instructor—36 minutes, assistant professor—44 minutes, associate professor—43 minutes, and professor—44 minutes; only the lecturer and instructor ranks had shorter interviews than the overall average. When average lengths of interviews were compared by college affiliation, e.g., College of Fine Arts and College of Business, all colleges fell within five minutes above or below the average overall length of 43 minutes with the exceptions of College of General Studies (57 minutes) and several with faculty rank who were not classroom teachers (35 minutes).

The 100% response rate meant that the sample numbers were exactly those in the sample by stratified variables and subgroups (see Table 3). Therefore, the sample numbers on the variables of sex and time when faculty were hired were representative of their
proportion in the population.

Table 4 indicates by sex and total the degrees held by those in the sample. Except for one male, all males and females held both undergraduate and masters' degrees. However, only 54% of the sample held doctorates, with 39 males accounting for 48% and 5 females for 6% of those doctorates.

Table 4

Degrees Held in Sample by Sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degrees Held</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th></th>
<th>Female</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Freq.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Freq.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n = 82 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>81 99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>81 99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>44 54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The sample was broken down into academic ranks by sex; these data are presented in Table 5. The percentages in the first two rows were calculated from the total number of each, e.g., the largest rank category of all males in the sample was professor (43%), while the largest rank category of all females in the sample was assistant.
(58%). The percentage in the bottom line was calculated from the total number in the sample ($n = 82$). The two largest rank categories in the total sample were professor (35.4%) and assistant (34.1%).

Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Prof. Freq. %</th>
<th>Prof. %</th>
<th>Assoc. Freq. %</th>
<th>Assoc. %</th>
<th>Asst. Freq. %</th>
<th>Asst. %</th>
<th>Inst. / Lectr. Freq. %</th>
<th>Lectr. %</th>
<th>Total Freq. %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>27 43</td>
<td>17 27</td>
<td>17 27</td>
<td>2 3</td>
<td>63 100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2 10.5</td>
<td>2 10.5</td>
<td>11 58</td>
<td>4 21</td>
<td>19 100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage of Total Sample

| 35.4  | 23.1 | 34.1 | 7.3 | 100 |

Note. Table 5 does not include the promotions of five faculty from the sample which were announced after completion of the interviews: one male associate to professor and three females and one male assistant to associates.

Table 6 indicates that the majority of the females in the sample (58%), males in the sample (54%), and the combination of males and females (55%) had held only their present position as higher education faculty. When the percentage of those who had been employed at one other higher education institution was added to these figures, i.e.,
females, 58% and 37% = 95%; males, 54% and 30% = 84%; and the combination, 55% and 32% = 87%, it could be inferred that few faculty in the sample could be considered as highly mobile, whether by choice or circumstances.

Table 6

Number of Full-Time Higher Education Positions Held by Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Freq.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Freq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>n = 19</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>n = 63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One piece of unsolicited descriptive data was that 15% (12) of the sample had served in the past either as deans of a college or as department chairs or heads. Subjects were not asked if they had or had not served in either role, which indicated that the 15% was probably a conservative figure. The information was contained in
background data subjects offered about their specific insights into the hiring processes.

Analysis of Data

An Interview Schedule Codebook (see Appendix B) was developed to name, describe, outline possible response categories, and identify appropriate code numbers for all variables. Each of the 82 interview schedules was then coded by the researcher. Some responses to questions had been coded at the time of interview, i.e., there was an exact match between response and categories developed by the researcher which were on the interview schedule. Other responses included a narrative which had to be analyzed and placed into an appropriate category.

After the semi-structured questions had been coded, a content analysis of open-ended responses was done. First, the responses to the questions "Let's assume tomorrow you had to begin looking for a different position in higher education. How would you go about it?" and "Do you believe the hiring process in higher education has changed over the years? If no, how is it the same? If yes, in what ways has it changed?" were typed from the researcher's notes (see Appendix E). Each subject's response to these questions and other additional recorded comments made throughout the interview then were coded on 12 variables for use in hypothesis testing, e.g.,
methods which would be used in looking for a job, and for descriptive data, e.g., influence of current job market conditions. Thus, even though all the comments made throughout the interview were not included in this report, they were considered when coding. These additional comments were usually in response to the question "What was the contact through which you first learned about a position at this university?" and reporting the narrative would have violated the confidentiality promised to the sample.

After the researcher completed the coding, a cover sheet (see Appendix C) was attached to each interview schedule. This sheet contained the coded responses on 22 variables, e.g., the identification number, length of interview, professional activity index total, degrees held, and the responses from the content analysis. The raw data from each of the 82 interviews were then keypunched to create a data bank. After the summary frequency distributions were calculated from these data, several additional variables were created through collapsing and/or combining existing categories. These additional variables were necessary for hypothesis testing.

Nominal data were the primary level of measurement and analyses appropriate for nominal data were completed. First, summary frequency distributions were calculated for all variables. Second, either the one- or two-variable chi square or Fisher's exact

\[ \chi^2 \]

Throughout this study \( \chi^2 \) was a representation of the Greek letter chi square.
test was applied in testing the null hypotheses of all research hypotheses using a probability of .05 for committing a Type I error (alpha).

The one-variable $X^2$ was used in testing the hypotheses that informal contacts were used by all faculty more than formal methods; that informal contacts would be used more than formal methods in an academic job search; and that faculty believed informal contacts have as much or more influence on the hiring process now than in the past. The two-variable $X^2$ was used in testing the hypothesis that faculty with high professional activity have been more active as links in the informal network than faculty with low professional activity.

The Fisher's exact test was used in testing hypotheses where variables could be placed in a 2 x 2 contingency table: that faculty hired during the tightening job market used informal contacts more than faculty hired during the expansion period; that fewer faculty who held one or more degrees from the hiring institution were hired during the tightening job market than during the expansion period; that women used informal contacts less than men; and that faculty with high professional and high informal network link activity were more active in the academic job market than faculty with low professional and no informal network link activity.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The purpose of this chapter is to present the major data results from the hypotheses tested. Also included are data that elaborate on results found when testing the hypotheses.

Informal Contacts Used in Hiring Process: The Past

The extent to which informal networks functioned in the higher education hiring process was the major focus in this study. The first dimension of informal networks studied was their use in the first stage of the hiring process, referred to as the search stage. It was hypothesized that informal methods have been used more frequently than formal methods. To collect data to test this hypothesis, all subjects were asked: "What was the contact through which you first learned about a position at this university?" From the events then described by the subject, it was possible for the researcher to place the response in one of 15 categories. These categories had been developed by the researcher through examination of previous mail questionnaires (Brown, 1965b, 1967; Marshall, 1964) and interview schedules (Caplow & McGee, 1958; McGee, 1971) which had included items on job mobility in higher education. Table 7 presents
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the summary frequency distributions of these responses.

Contact categories presented in Table 7 were combined to create two classifications: 1-8 were labelled "informal contacts" and accounted for 73% of all sources of information about a position at this university at the search stage of the hiring process; 9-15 were labelled "formal methods" and accounted for 27% of all sources of information at the search stage. The two largest single sources of information were from the informal contact classifications: "other professional friend" (23%) and "chair/head of department" (12%). A combination of the four categories which represented informal personal contacts developed during graduate school work--"graduate advisor," "other graduate professor," "chair/head of department," and "graduate classmate"--accounted for 35% of all contacts used to first learn about a position at this university. Only one formal method was used by more than 5% of all subjects: unsolicited letters or calls were made by 11% of the subjects to an unknown recipient at the hiring university.

The null hypothesis that the proportion of informal contacts equalled the proportion of formal methods was tested by applying the one-variable \( \chi^2 \) with (alpha), the probability of committing a Type I error, equal to .05. As can be concluded from data summarized in Table 8, the null hypothesis was rejected, and the research hypothesis that informal contacts have been used more
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Graduate advisor</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Other graduate professor</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Chair/head of department</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Graduate classmate</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Undergraduate professor</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Faculty colleague</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Other professional friend</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Other informal contact</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. College placement office</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Unsolicited call/letter</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Professional association advertisement</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Convention placement service</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Commercial teacher's agency</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Other advertisement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Other formal method</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ n = 82 \quad 99.5 \]

Table 7
Contact Through Which Faculty First Learned About a Position at This University
than formal methods in the higher education hiring process was confirmed.

Table 8

$X^2$ Test of Method Through Which Faculty First Learned About a Position at This University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Test of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Informal contacts</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>$X^2 = 17.610$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal methods</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>df = 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$n = 82$</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>$p = .00^*$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\*p < .05

The researcher also wanted to determine the extent to which subjects were aware of informal personal contacts made on their behalf after the search stage of the hiring process at this university. To collect these data faculty were first asked: "After you had applied for the position and before the interview, do you know if any personal contacts regarding the position were made on your behalf?" Table 9 gives the summary descriptive statistics of their responses.

As Table 9 indicates, 40% of the subjects said the question regarding known personal contacts made on their behalf between their application and interview was not applicable. One of two
### Table 9

**Personal Contacts Made Between Application and Interview**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal Contacts</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did not know</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Known Personal Contacts</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate advisor</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other graduate professor</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair/head of graduate department</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate classmate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate professor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other professional friend</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total known personal contacts</strong></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not applicable: No formal application procedure</strong></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>33</strong></td>
<td><strong>40</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ n = 82 \quad 100 \]

reasons was given with the not applicable response: either the position was offered at some time during the first contact or the subject was interviewed after the first contact without being asked to submit formal application papers. While 31% did not have specific knowledge about personal contact at this stage of the hiring process, 29% did have such knowledge. The most frequent known contacts were
with graduate advisors (9%) and other professional friends (7%) of the applicant. A combination of the four categories of personal contacts related to graduate school work—graduate advisors, other graduate professors, chairs/heads of departments, and graduate classmates—accounted for 20% of the 29% known personal contacts made on applicants' behalf between their application and interview.

Additional information about subjects' awareness of informal personal contacts made on their behalf after the search stage of the hiring process at this university was obtained by asking: "After the interview and before you were offered the position, do you know if any personal contacts regarding the position were made on your behalf?" Table 10 gives the summary descriptive statistics of their responses.

Data contained in Table 10 indicate that 26% of the faculty said the question of known personal contacts made on their behalf between the interview and the job offer was not applicable because no interview was held or the position was offered at the time of the interview. The "did not know" category increased to 67% and known personal contacts made at this stage of the hiring process decreased to 7%.

A comparison of data summarized in Tables 9 and 10 indicated that there were substantial differences in what faculty knew about personal contacts made on their behalf at two periods after the search stage of the hiring process, that is, between the application
Table 10

Personal Contacts Made Between Interview and Job Offer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal Contacts</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did not know</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known Personal Contacts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate advisor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other graduate professor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair/head of graduate department</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate classmate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate professor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other professional friend</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable: No interview or job offer at interview</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n = 82</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

and the interview and between the interview and the job offer. Those who did not have specific knowledge about personal contacts made in the two periods more than doubled (31% to 67%) as the hiring process progressed, while those who had specific knowledge about personal contacts decreased by more than two-thirds (from 29% to 7%) in those two periods. In addition, all faculty members did not go
through linear stages in the hiring process, i.e., search, applicancy, interview, and job offer. Rather, two-fifths (40%) did not go through a formal application procedure, while more than one-fourth (26%) did not have an interview or were offered the position at the interview.

Informal Contacts Used in Hiring Process: The Future

A second hypothesis dealt directly with the extent that informal networks function in the higher education hiring process: It was hypothesized that faculty would indicate they would use informal contacts in searching for other academic positions more than formal methods. To collect data to test this hypothesis, subjects were asked an open-ended question: "Let's assume tomorrow you had to begin looking for a different position in higher education. How would you go about it?" Subjects were not prompted to discuss either informal and/or formal methods or asked to indicate a preference.

A content analysis of each response was done and specific methods which subjects mentioned they would use in a job search were classified as informal, e.g., call personal friends, or formal, e.g., read advertisements in the Chronicle of Higher Education. In addition, a preference-of-method dimension was added to the content analysis, resulting in six mutually exclusive categories which indicated if subjects would use informal or formal methods exclusively,
both methods with emphasis on one method, both methods with no preference specified or alluded to, or had no comments. Individual responses were placed in one of these categories.

Table 11 presents the summary descriptive statistics for methods which faculty would use to search for a different academic position. (See Appendix E for individual responses to the question. Responses were reproduced verbatim as much as possible. However, to ensure that the subjects could not be identified, specific material was made general when individuals and/or departments potentially could be identified from responses. Quotation marks were used only to ensure that certain words, phrases, or thoughts would not be interpreted as the researcher's paraphrases of the subjects' responses.)

Data in Table 11 indicate that informal methods would be used exclusively by 32% of the faculty in looking for another academic position, but only 1% of the faculty would exclusively use formal methods. While 66% of the faculty would use both informal and formal methods, 49% of these would emphasize informal methods, 7% would emphasize formal methods, and 10% did not indicate a preference. Thus, informal methods would be used by 98% of the faculty in searching for another academic position.

Two classifications were created by combining the categories presented in Table 11. Frequencies from the categories "informal
"exclusively" and "both: emphasize informal" were combined to become an indicator of preference for using informal methods in looking for another academic position. Frequencies from the "formal exclusively," "both: emphasize formal," and "both: no preference specified" categories were combined to become an indicator of preference for using formal methods in looking for another academic position. The "both: no preference specified" and "no comments" categories were included in the "formal preferred" classification as a conservative measure to counteract any possible bias during the researcher's initial coding of responses.

Table 11

Methods Which Faculty Would Use To Search for a Different Academic Position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal exclusively</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal exclusively</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both: Emphasize informal</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both: Emphasize formal</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both: No preference specified</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = 82</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The null hypothesis that the proportion of faculty who preferred using informal methods equalled the proportion of faculty who preferred using formal methods was tested by applying the one-variable $X^2$ with (alpha), the probability of committing a Type I error, equal to .05. As can be concluded from data summarized in Table 12, the null hypothesis was rejected, and the research hypothesis that faculty would indicate they would use informal contacts in searching for other academic positions more than formal methods was confirmed.

Table 12

$X^2$ Test of Method Preferred to Search for a Different Academic Position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Test of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Informal preferred</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>80.5</td>
<td>$X^2 = 30.488$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal preferred</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>df = 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n = 82</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>p &lt; .00*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Many specific items were contained in responses to the open-ended question of how faculty would go about looking for a different academic position in higher education, even though subjects had not been cued into commenting on informal and/or formal methods in
general or specifically. Thus, the researcher decided to do three additional content analyses of the responses. The first analysis was of specific informal methods which faculty indicated they would use, the second was of specific formal methods which would be used, and the third was of faculty intent to leave higher education. Categories were developed, responses coded accordingly, and frequency distributions calculated for all three analyses. The results of the analysis of informal methods are presented in Table 13.

Table 13
Informal Methods Specified for Use in Searching for a Different Academic Position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Informal Method</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not use</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone calls only</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letters only</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone calls and letters (both)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other specific method</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal: Method not specifically identified</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 82 100
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As indicated in Table 13, 98% of the faculty identified informal methods as an approach they would use in searching for another academic position. No one said they would not use informal methods, while 2% made no comments about their use. Use of phone calls only was the most frequently specified informal method (22%) while 6% would use letters only, and 21% would use both phone calls and letters. Thus, a combination of these three categories indicated that phone calls and/or letters to known persons would be used by 49% of all faculty in looking for a different academic position. A variety of other informal methods were specified by 18% of the faculty, while 31% who indicated they would use informal methods did not identify a specific method.

The content analysis of the formal methods that faculty said they would use in looking for a different position was done by identifying three variables which were mentioned with high frequency: phone calls and/or letters to unknown recipients, reading advertisements or listings, and convention placement services. Each response was coded on all three variables; because these variables were not mutually exclusive, faculty potentially could have indicated use of all three formal methods. The results are presented in Table 14.

Data in Table 14 indicate that the most preferred formal method was reading advertisements or listings of job openings (56%), while 29% would use convention placement services and 27% would
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Formal Methods</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phone calls/letters</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not use</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone calls only</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letters only</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone calls and letters (both)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>n = 82</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reading advertisements</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not use</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read advertisements</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>n = 82</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Convention placement services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No comment</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not use</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use convention placement services</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>n = 82</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
use phone calls and/or letters to unknown recipients. Reading advertisements also had the greatest number of faculty who specifically indicated they would not use this method (17%); 14% would not use convention placement services and 12% would not use phone calls and/or letters to unknown recipients. The reading advertisement's category also had the fewest no comments about its use (27%), while 57% made no comments about using convention placement services and 61% made no comments about using phone calls and/or letters.

Whether faculty would or might leave higher education was the subject of the third additional content analysis of responses to the open-ended question regarding how faculty would look for a different academic position. Given that they would be required, for whatever reason, to look for another academic position, 30% said they would or might leave higher education. It was concluded by the researcher that this percentage was particularly unusual because the wording of the question did not suggest that an opinion on the subject was desired, yet 30% felt strongly enough about leaving higher education to present it as an alternative to conducting a job search for another academic position.

Informal Contacts Used in Hiring Process: Changes

A third hypothesis dealt directly with the extent that informal networks function in the higher education hiring process. It was
hypothesized that the majority of faculty would indicate that they believed informal contact methods had the same or greater influence on the hiring process now than in the past. To collect data to test this hypothesis, subjects were asked an open-ended question: "Do you believe the hiring process in higher education has changed over the years?" "No" responses were then asked: "How is it the same?" and "yes" responses were asked: "In what ways has it changed?" "Do not know" responses were asked to comment on what they had observed about the hiring process. Subjects were not asked to comment on any specific areas of behavior where change might have occurred, i.e., use of informal and/or formal methods in the hiring process.

A content analysis was done of responses which followed the additional probe question. Three mutually exclusive categories were developed for comments relating to the perceived influence of informal contact methods in the hiring process now as compared to the past: no comments, less or no influence, and same or greater influence. (See Appendix E for complete responses to the question. Again, the only changes made in the responses were to generalize comments to protect confidentiality of the sample and their departmental affiliation.)

In the first response to the question about changes over the years in the higher education hiring process, 34% said no, 63% said
yes, and 3% said they did not know. Because these percentages contained no substantive data about why the faculty had made these responses, no statistical test was applied to them.

The null hypothesis that the proportion of faculty who believed informal contacts had less or no influence on the hiring process equalled the proportion of faculty who believed informal contacts had the same or greater influence on the hiring process was tested by applying the one-variable $X^2$ with (alpha), the probability of committing a Type I error, equal to .05. As indicated by data summarized in Table 15, the null hypothesis was rejected, and the research hypothesis that faculty would believe informal contacts had the same or greater influence on the hiring process now than in the past was confirmed.

Table 15

$X^2$ Test of Perceived Current Influence of Informal Contacts in the Hiring Process As Compared to the Past

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Informal Contact Influence</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Test of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$X^2 = 130.049$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less or none</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>df = 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same or greater</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>p = .00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>82</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05
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Table 15 data indicate that, despite variability in the first response to the question of whether they believed the hiring process in higher education had changed over the years, in the responses to the follow-up probe 93% of the faculty expressed the belief that informal contacts had the same or greater influence in the hiring process now than in the past.

Three additional analyses were done of the responses to the question "Do you believe the hiring process in higher education has changed over the years?" and the additional probe questions. The first analysis was of comments about the number of job openings affecting the hiring process, the second analysis was of comments about degree requirements affecting the hiring process, and the third analysis was of comments about legal and/or procedural changes affecting the outcome of the hiring process. Mutually exclusive categories were developed, responses coded accordingly, and summary frequency distributions calculated for all three analyses. In addition, the researcher decided to test the significance of the data related to the effect of legal and/or procedural changes. Such a test was not part of the researcher's original design. However, the data and their analysis were determined to be helpful in interpreting data about the influence of informal contacts, primarily because a major intent of legal and/or procedural changes was that they would reduce the influence of informal contacts in the hiring process.
The summary frequency distributions of comments on the effect of number of job openings and degree requirements on the hiring process are presented in Table 16. Although 25% made no comments about the availability of jobs in higher education affecting the hiring process, the remainder (75%) did: The majority (56%) believed there were fewer jobs available and 7% indicated no jobs were available, while 12% believed there were more job openings. The no jobs and more jobs comments were given in the context of changes within specific programs in departments, i.e., rapid growth or rapid constriction. Fewer comments were made about the effect of degree requirements and their possible affect on the hiring process: 67% made no comment, while 22% of the 33% who did comment believed that degree requirements have increased over time; 11% believed degree requirements have stayed the same or are less.

The data obtained about the effect of legal and/or procedural changes were tested for statistical significance by applying the one-variable $X^2$ with (alpha), the probability of committing a Type I error, equal to .05. As can be concluded from Table 17, significant differences in faculty perceptions about the influence of legal and/or procedural changes on the outcome of the hiring process did exist. While 30% of the faculty made no comments on the subject, nearly 50% of all faculty believed that these changes, although altering the specifics of the hiring process itself, had little or no influence on
Table 16

Comments on Number of Job Openings and Degree Requirements Affecting the Hiring Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Job Openings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fewer</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Degree Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same or less</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the outcome of the hiring process, i.e., hiring decisions were not necessarily better or different than before the changes were introduced, and personal contacts were still made throughout the stages of the hiring process. When considering only faculty who commented on the subject (70%), 68% (39 of the 57 who commented) believed the changes had little or no influence on the outcome of the hiring process. Of the 22% commenting that legal and/or procedural changes had some or great influence on the outcome of the hiring process, only one subject indicated that such changes precluded any use of informal contacts (see Appendix E, observation 21).

Table 17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Influence on Outcome</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Test of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$X^2 = 8.366$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little or none</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>$df = 2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some or great</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>$p = .02^*$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$n = 82 \quad 100$

$^p < .05$
Thus, the first three hypotheses tested indicated the actual, intended, and perceived extent of the functioning of informal networks in the higher education hiring process for full-time faculty members. It was concluded from testing the hypotheses that informal networks had actually been used more than formal methods, they would be the preferred method in a current job search, and they were perceived as having the same or greater influence in the hiring process now than in the past. In addition, nearly 70% of the faculty who commented on legal and/or procedural changes and their effect on the outcome of the hiring process believed such changes had little or no influence on the outcome.

Informal Contacts Used in Hiring Process:
By Time Hired and Sex

The next two hypotheses required sample data to test whether the variables of when faculty were hired and their sex would significantly affect use of informal contacts and formal methods.

It was hypothesized that faculty hired during the tightening job market have used informal methods in the higher education hiring process more than faculty hired during the expansion period. The population had been stratified into three groups according to the criterion of time hired: between May 1971 and February 1978; between May 1961 and April 1971; and during and before April 1961.
The first group was considered hired during the tightening job market and the remaining two groups combined and considered hired during the expansion period. These data were put into a 2 x 2 contingency table with the previously combined categories of the informal or formal methods by which the subject first learned about a position at this university (see Tables 7 and 8).

The null hypothesis that the proportion of faculty hired during the tightening job market who used informal contacts equalled the proportion of faculty hired during the expansion period who used informal contacts was tested by applying the Fisher's exact with (alpha), the probability of committing a Type I error, at .05. As can be concluded from data summarized in Table 18, the null hypothesis was not rejected, and the research hypothesis that faculty hired during the tightening job market have used informal network methods more than faculty hired during the expansion period in the higher education hiring process was not confirmed.

The data summarized in Table 18 indicate that both the faculty hired during the tightening job market and the expansion period had more than 70% who first learned about a position at this university through an informal contact. This finding emphasized the lack of relationship between the variables of time hired and method used at the search stage of the hiring process.
Table 18
Use of Informal or Formal Method at Search Stage of Hiring Process by Time-Hired Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>May 1971 - Feb. 1978</th>
<th>During/Before April 1971</th>
<th>(P)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Informal</td>
<td>17  71</td>
<td>43  74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>7   29</td>
<td>15  26</td>
<td>.79*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(n = 24\) 100 \(n = 58\) 100

*\(p < .05\)

Summary frequency distributions were calculated of the time-hired groups use of specific informal and formal methods (see Table 19). Contacts made during graduate work, through graduate advisor, other graduate professor, chair/head of department, and graduate classmate were combined and found to be the informal method by which 50% of the faculty hired within the last seven years, i.e., the tightening job market, first learned about a position at this university; the chair/head of a department was identified as the most frequent source (25%). No one in this time-hired group reported undergraduate professors and faculty colleagues as the source of information, but 17% identified another professional friend as the source.
### Table 19

Use of Specific Informal and Formal Methods at Search Stage of Hiring Process by Time-Hired Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Time-Hired Groups</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May 1971-February 1978</td>
<td>During/before April 1971</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Freq.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Freq.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate advisor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other graduate professor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair/head of department</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate classmate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate professor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty colleague</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other professional friend</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/informal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College placement office</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsolicited call or letter</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional association</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>advertisement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convention placement service</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial teacher's agency</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other advertisement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/formal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n =</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Only two formal methods accounted for more than 5% of the sources of information for this position: professional association advertisement (13%) and unsolicited call or letter to an unknown recipient (8%).

Still referring to Table 19, faculty hired during or before April 1971, i.e., the expansion period, indicated the information source about a position at this university was approximately equal for all categories of informal contacts, except for other professional friends (26%). When combined, the graduate work contact categories of graduate advisor, other graduate professor, chair/head of department, and graduate classmate accounted for 30% of the informal sources of information. The formal method of unsolicited call or letter to an unknown recipient (12%) was the only formal method used by more than 5% of faculty hired during the expansion period.

The relationship between the variables of sex and the use of informal network methods was also investigated: it was hypothesized that women faculty have used informal networks in the higher education hiring process less than men faculty. The variable of sex was put into a 2 x 2 contingency table with the previously combined categories which indicated the informal or formal method by which the subject first learned about a position at this university (see Tables 7 and 8).

The null hypothesis that the proportion of women who have used informal contacts equalled the proportion of men who have used
informal contacts was tested by applying the Fisher's exact with (alpha), the probability of committing a Type I error, at .05. As can be concluded from data summarized in Table 20, the null hypothesis was not rejected, and the research hypothesis that women faculty have used informal networks less than men faculty in the higher education hiring process was not confirmed.

Table 20

Use of Informal or Formal Method at Search Stage of Hiring Process by Sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th></th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Freq.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Freq.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>.77*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ n = 19 \quad 100 \quad n = 63 \quad 100 \]

\[ *p > .05 \]

Data summarized in Table 20 indicate that more than 70% of both women and men faculty first learned about a position at this university through an informal contact, with the proportion of women who used informal contacts 8% greater than men, thus emphasizing the lack of relationship between the variables of sex and the method used at the search stage of the hiring process.

Summary frequency distributions were calculated for a comparison of women's and men's use of specific informal and formal
methods at the search stage of the hiring process and are presented in Table 21. Other professional friends were the primary informal contact source of job information at the search stage for both women (32%) and men (21%). Women's second largest source of information was chairs or heads of departments (21%), while 9% of the men received information from that source. No women reported the informal contacts of graduate advisor, graduate classmates, or faculty colleague as the source of information about a job opening at this university, but the same categories, when combined, were the job information source for 27% of the men. Women obtained information from the two formal sources of unsolicited calls or letters to unknown recipients and commercial teacher's agencies, while men obtained information from all formal sources. Thus, of the 15 possible informal and formal methods summarized in Table 21, information came through seven sources for women and 14 sources for men.

Data collected to test the first three hypotheses were analyzed by sex and those frequency distributions compared with the frequency distribution data summarized in Table 20. These data are presented in Table 22. Although 79% of the women and 71% of the men had used informal methods in the search stage of the hiring process, 63% of the women and 86% of the men indicated that they would prefer to use informal contacts if they were now to begin a
Table 21

Use of Specific Informal and Formal Methods at Search Stage of Hiring Process by Sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Freq.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Freq.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate advisor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other graduate professor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair/head</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate classmate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate professor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty colleague</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other professional friend</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other informal contact</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College placement office</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsolicited call/letter</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional association</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>advertisement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convention placement service</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial teacher's agency</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other advertisement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other formal method</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 19 100  n = 63 100
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### Table 22

Summary by Sex on Three Dimensions of Methods Used in Hiring Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Freq.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Freq.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>n</strong> = 19</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td><strong>n</strong> = 63</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Job search use preferred**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Informal</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>n</strong> = 19</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td><strong>n</strong> = 63</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Perceived influence of informal**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Influence</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Same or greater</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less or none</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>n</strong> = 19</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td><strong>n</strong> = 63</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

job search for another academic position. More women would rely on formal contacts in a job search (37%) than men would (14%). In addition, 84% of the women and 95% of the men believed that the effect of informal contacts in the hiring process is the same or greater now than in the past. Thus, differences existed in each category, not only between women and men, but between categories.
within each sex: more women had used informal contacts to first learn about a position at this university (79%) than would use informal contacts in a current academic job search (63%), but their perception that informal contacts have the same or greater influence in the hiring process now than in the past was greater than either category (84%). Men had used informal contacts less (71%) to first learn about a position at this university than they would use them in a current job search (86%), while more (95%) believed that informal contacts have the same or greater influence in the hiring process now than in the past.

Informal Contacts Used in Hiring Process: Inbreeding

Another dimension of informal networks that was examined was inbreeding activity, i.e., those hired who held one or more degrees from the hiring institution. It was hypothesized that faculty hired during the tightening job market have been the recipients of inbreeding activity in the higher education hiring process less than faculty hired during the expansion period. All subjects identified the degree-granting institution for all degrees held and it was found that 21 (26%) held one or more degrees from the hiring institution. These data, along with the two time-hired periods of tightening job market and expansion period, were put into a 2 x 2 contingency table.
The null hypothesis that the proportion of faculty hired during the tightening job market who had one or more degrees from the hiring institution equalled the proportion of faculty hired during the expansion period who had one or more degrees from the hiring institution was tested by applying the Fisher's exact test with (alpha), the probability of committing a Type I error, equal to .05. As can be concluded from data summarized in Table 23, the null hypothesis was not rejected, and the research hypothesis that faculty hired during the tightening job market have been the recipients of inbreeding activity less than faculty hired during the expansion period was not confirmed. The proportion of faculty hired during the tightening job market who held one or more degrees from the hiring institution was actually greater (29%) than of faculty hired during the expansion period (24%).

Table 23

Inbreeding Activity by Time-Hired Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree from Hiring Institution</th>
<th>Time-Hired Groups</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May 1971-February 1978</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Freq.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Freq.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>.78*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 24 100  n = 58 100

*p > .05
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Summary frequency distributions were calculated for each degree and the degree-granting institution (see Table 24). Of the separate degrees held, a master's degree from the hiring institution was held by 21%, while 12% of the undergraduate degrees had been earned at the hiring institution.

Table 24

Inbreeding Activity by Degrees Held

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree-granting Institution</th>
<th>Degrees Held</th>
<th>2-year</th>
<th>Undergraduate</th>
<th>Masters</th>
<th>Doctorate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Freq.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Freq.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiring institution</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>64 78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>n = 82</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>n = 82 100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of the data used to test the inbreeding activity hypothesis indicated that a relationship existed between sex and inbreeding activity at this institution. The Fisher's exact test was applied to the data to determine the statistical significance. As indicated by the results presented in Table 25, the probability of obtaining these proportions or proportions more deviant is .00. Not only were females the majority of the recipients of inbreeding activity, the majority of women hired at this institution held one or
more degrees from the hiring institution.

Table 25
Inbreeding Activity by Sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree from Hiring Institution</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Freq.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Freq.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = 19</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td>n =63</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05

Informal Contacts Used in Hiring Process: Information Links, Professional Activity, and Other Academic Positions

The relationship between faculty members' professional activity and their degree of on-going activity as job-related information links was also investigated by the researcher. It was hypothesized that faculty with high professional activity have been more active as links in the informal network than faculty with low professional activity. To test this hypothesis, data collected about link activities and professional activities were used to develop indexes for both variables.

The link activity data were collected through two series of questions. The first question was: "Do you receive requests from
hiring institutions to suggest potential candidates for higher education job openings?" If the answer was "yes," the subject was asked who made the requests, their frequency, and whether they had increased, decreased, or stayed the same during the past six years. The second question was: "Do individuals seeking new or different positions in higher education ask you for information about job opportunities?" If the answer was "yes," the same series of follow-up questions were asked.

The link activity index was created by classifying those who responded "no" to both questions as "None," those who responded "no" to either question or who reported activity with a frequency of once or twice a year on both questions as "Low," and all other combinations of frequencies of activity as "High."

The professional activity data were obtained through direct questions to the subject (see Appendix A) or examination of vita provided by the subject. The researcher scored subgroups of questions using the following scale: university and departmental activity (0-4), state and national professional organization activity (0-5), and publications and research activity (0-7). These scores were added to those for rank (lecturer = 0, instructor = 1, assistant professor = 2, associate professor = 3, and professor = 4) and degrees held (undergraduate only = 1, masters = 2, and doctorate = 4). The result was a single professional activity index score which ranged
from 0 to 25. The total number of subjects was divided to create three groups of scores: the range from 0 to 12 was classified "Low" \((n = 28)\), from 13 to 17 was classified "Medium" \((n = 27)\), and from 18 to 25 was classified as "High" \((n = 27)\).

The null hypothesis that the proportion of faculty with high professional activity and high link activity equalled the proportion of faculty with low professional activity and high link activity was tested by applying the two-variable \(X^2\) with (alpha), the probability of committing a Type I error, equal to .05. As can be concluded from data summarized in Table 26, the null hypothesis was rejected, and the research hypothesis that faculty with high professional activity have been more active as links in the informal network than faculty with low professional activity was confirmed. All faculty with high professional activity had some link activity: 41% had low link activity and 59% had high link activity. In the low professional activity group, 29% had no link activity, 64% had low link activity, and 7% had high link activity.

Summary frequency distributions of sources of informal network requests were included in the data gathered to test the hypothesis on the relationship between professional activity and informal network link activity. More faculty received requests from individuals for information about job opportunities (74%) than requests from hiring institutions to suggest potential candidates (40%). The
Table 26
Relationship between Professional Activity and Link Activity in Informal Networks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Link Activity</th>
<th>Professional Activity</th>
<th>Test of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low Freq.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$n=28$ 100    $n=27$ 100    $n=27$ 100

*$p << .05$

Role relationships between those making the requests and the faculty member receiving the requests were also identified. Of the 40% of the faculty reporting requests from hiring institutions, 22% indicated they received requests from more than one category of role relationship. Of the reported requests, professional colleagues were the largest group (63%), while former students (15%) and former professors (13%) were the only other sources of requests that totalled more than 5%.

Not only were there more faculty who received requests from individuals about job information opportunities (74%), this group also indicated more requests from two or more categories of role relationships (57%). Professional colleagues were the largest group (43%) to inquire about job opportunities. Former students accounted...
for 33% of all requests received and undergraduate or graduate classmates for 13%, while only 2% of the requests came from former professors. Thus, there were more informal network links with individuals inquiring about job opportunities than with hiring institutions looking for potential candidates, as well as a greater variety of role relationships with individuals inquiring about job opportunities.

The relationship between professional and link activity and activity in the academic job market was a final dimension of informal networks functioning in the higher education hiring process considered by the researcher. It was hypothesized that faculty with high professional activity and high activity as links in the informal network have been more active in the academic job market than faculty with low professional activity and no activity as links in the informal network.

The data to test this hypothesis were obtained by the following procedure. Those faculty with high professional activity and high link activity were put into one group. A second group consisted of those with low professional activity and no link activity. To obtain data about activity in the academic job market, subjects were asked: "In regard to other academic positions, do any of the following activities apply to you during the last three years: been approached about a job; submitted or been asked to submit credentials; interviewed?" "Yes" responses were asked about specific frequencies. Summary
frequency distributions of academic job market activity (see Table 27) indicate that 46% of the faculty had been active once or more during the last three years. Those reporting three or more instances of activity during the last three years totalled 31%. For analysis purposes all those who indicated no academic job market activity were put into one category and those who reported any activity were put into a second category.

Table 27

Activity in the Academic Job Market in the Past Three Years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Job Market Activities</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six or more</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( n = \frac{82}{100} )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The null hypothesis that the proportion of faculty with high professional and high link activity who had been on the academic job market equalled the proportion of faculty with low professional and link activity who had been on the academic job market was tested by
applying the Fisher's exact with (alpha), the probability of committing a Type I error, equal to .05. As could be concluded from data summarized in Table 28, the null hypothesis was not rejected and the research hypothesis that faculty with high professional and informal network link activity have been more active in the academic job market than faculty with low professional and informal network link activity was not confirmed. The proportions of those who had not been on the academic job market and had low or high professional/link activity were exactly the same as those who had been on the academic job market and had low or high professional/link activity.

Table 28

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional/Link Activity and Academic Job Market Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Job Market Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*P > .05

Summary

The null hypotheses were tested using sample data collected from university faculty by applying either the one- or two-variable $X^2$
or the Fisher's exact test with (alpha), the probability of committing a Type I error, equal to .05.

Four null hypotheses were rejected, and the research hypotheses confirmed, with the actual probability of falsely rejecting the null hypotheses .00. The confirmed research hypotheses were:

Informal contacts have been used more than formal methods in the higher education hiring process;
Faculty indicated they would use informal contacts more than formal methods in searching for another academic position;
Faculty believed informal contacts have the same or greater influence on the hiring process now than in the past;
Faculty with high professional activity were more active links in the informal network than faculty with low professional activity.

The following null hypotheses were not rejected and the research hypotheses were not confirmed with the exact probabilities of obtaining the given or more deviant data if the null hypotheses were true; all greater than .75:

The proportion of faculty hired during the tightening job market who used informal contacts equalled the proportion of faculty hired during the expansion period who used informal contacts;
The proportion of women who used informal contacts equalled
the proportion of men who used informal contacts;

The proportion of faculty hired during the tightening job market who had one or more degrees from the hiring institution equalled the proportion of faculty hired during the expansion period who had one or more degrees from the hiring institution;

The proportion of faculty with high professional and link activity who had been on the academic job market equalled the proportion of faculty with low professional and link activity who had been on the academic job market.
CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, FURTHER STUDIES, AND SUMMARY

The purpose of this chapter is to present the conclusions based on the results of the study, the implications of the study, suggestions for further research, and a summary of the study.

Conclusions

The major conclusion from this study of informal networks functioning in the hiring process at one public university was that personal contacts used within informal networks have dominated the hiring process in the past and continue their domination. Informal networks were used by 73% of the faculty to find their present positions; informal networks were the preferred method of 80% of the faculty in searching for other academic positions, but would be used by 98%; and informal networks were perceived by 93% of the faculty as having the same or greater influence on the hiring process now than in the past. This conclusion was consistent with the conventional wisdom and empirical data which described a belief in and reported specific uses of personal contacts within informal networks in the hiring process. The presence and prevalent use of informal networks was noted over the years from Veblen...
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(1918/1957) and Wilson (1942) through the 1970s (Lewis, 1975; Livesey, 1975). Empirical data obtained by Brown (1965b, 1967), Caplow and McGee (1958), Marshall (1964), and McGee (1971) indicated that informal networks were widely used in the hiring process: specific reported use was never less than 50% and ranged to 79%.

The conclusion that informal networks dominate the hiring process was supported also by three findings related to use across time, by sex, and inbreeding. (a) Informal networks were used consistently across time: current faculty, hired between 1935 and 1971, reported only slightly greater use of informal networks (74%) than current faculty hired since 1971 (71%). This finding also was compatible with the previously cited conventional wisdom and empirical data which discussed and reported the widespread use of personal contacts in faculty hiring. (b) Informal networks were used extensively by both women (79%) and men (71%). Men's use, however, was spread across the informal methods, while women's use was concentrated in two categories (chair/head of department and professional friends). In addition, women were clustered at the two lowest ranks of lecturer/instructor and assistant professor (79%), while men were clustered at the two highest ranks of associate professor and professor (70%). It could be concluded that women had fewer informal methods at their disposal and the positions
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they were offered, as well as promotions received, were in the lower ranks. This suggests greater job activity for women within the institution, e.g., graduate students being offered instructorships, rather than between institutions. Thus, although women used informal networks somewhat more than men, it was a difference in kind rather than degree, i.e., intrastitutional as opposed to interinstitutional. These findings were consistent with the conventional wisdom that women generally are outside the academic prestige system and the job information flow between institutions (Caplow & McGee, 1958; Lewis, 1975). (c) Inbreeding, i.e., one or more degrees from the hiring institution, continued to function as part of the hiring process. Inbreeding was a characteristic of 24% of the current faculty hired during the expansion years (through 1971) and of 29% of the current faculty hired during the tightening job market (since 1971), a difference which was not statistically significant. The percentages, however, were higher than the institutional average of 15% reported by Berelson (1960) and less than the findings of Hollingshead (1938), who included relatives and friends in his definition of inbreeding. In addition, inbreeding was the dominant avenue within informal networks for women (58%), but not for men (16%). This gave further support to the contention that women's informal networks are more intrastitutional than interinstitutional.
It could also be concluded that faculty who have more visibility in their fields through high professional activity are more active as links in the informal networks: 59% of those with high professional activity also had high link activity, while only 7% of those with low professional activity had high link activity. This was consistent with the research of Brown (1965b, 1967), Caplow and McGee (1958), and McGee (1971), which indicated that faculty with high professional prestige were more likely to be one of the personal contacts within the informal networks who shared job information with hiring institutions and those seeking employment.

It could be concluded further that high professional and informal link activity does not result in any more academic job market activity than for those with low professional and informal link activity. There was virtually no difference in the proportion of those with high and low professional and informal link activity who were active or inactive in the academic job market. This was not consistent with the findings of the researchers just cited where high activity as informal network links and high professional activity were primary criteria for activity in the academic job market.

Several conclusions related to how informal networks function. (a) The two most important groups of personal contacts in informal networks are those which are established in graduate school and maintained after leaving, and those developed and
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maintained with professional colleagues. (b) Phone calls and/or letters is the informal method most widely used to transmit employment questions and information. (c) The primary personal contact groups and informal method are the same whether faculty are seeking employment, being sought for employment, or functioning as information links. These conclusions parallel the general observations and conclusions of the major empirical data, as well as the conventional wisdom, which described a similar web of activity in informal networks as personal contacts were developed before and during academic careers.

A final conclusion was that procedural changes in the hiring process which have occurred since 1972 because of legal requirements have not significantly reduced the dominant use of informal networks. This conclusion was supported by the majority of the findings of this study. In addition, while no question was asked which specifically related to the subject and 30% of the faculty made no comments about it, 48% offered observations which indicated that procedural changes have had little or no influence on the outcome of the hiring process. At the same time, 93% of the faculty believed informal networks had the same or greater influence on the hiring process now than in the past. A number of researchers, such as Fulton (1975), Lewis (1975), and Livesey (1975), had expressed a similar conclusion: despite legislation intended to reduce the influence
of informal networks on the hiring process, universities found it difficult to change traditional practices.

Implications

The interaction of three factors--fewer jobs, more equally qualified job-seekers, and legal sanctions--had on the surface seemed to signal the end of informal networks in the higher education hiring process. The implication of the findings and conclusions in this study, however, is that these legal and employment factors will continue to give greater, rather than less, importance to the informal communication networks. The emphasis will likely continue and increase for two basic reasons. (a) Informal networks represent a component of all social systems and human interaction: a preference to deal with those who are known and trusted from personal knowledge or who are known and trusted by someone who has credibility, rather than the unknown. Using personal or creditable second-hand knowledge about faculty candidates has been predominant in the hiring process. There are no signs that preferring the known to the unknown will decrease in its influence. (b) Although new hiring policies have resulted in regimented formal procedures, the traditional use of informal networks continues to operate covertly within those formal procedures. If the formal procedures were believed to be functioning adequately in finding and evaluating faculty candidates and if the
written procedures reflected the actual values of the individuals comprising the institution, such covert use of informal networks would not be necessary. Whether because of perceived inefficiency or lack of individual commitment, there seems to be a reluctance in most of the faculty members and the administrative hierarchy to substantially change the hiring process as it has operated for 300 years; the elaborate overt formal procedures appear to be primarily part of a defensive protection against potential legal action.

It would appear, therefore, that one of the affirmative action goals—to reduce the influence of informal network activity in the hiring process—has not been reached. There are indications of various degrees of implementation and little actual enforcement. The most widely noted change has been in the documentation procedures during the hiring process, but the informal network channels of personal conversations, calls, and letters are not to be found in that documentation. They are, however, prominently apparent in faculty member's descriptions of both their own and other faculty members' employment experiences.

Women and minorities once believed, and a few still do, that substantive changes in hiring outcome, i.e., more women and minorities actually hired, would follow substantive changes in the hiring procedure. Currently, however, there are indications that these groups have a more realistic understanding about the
functioning of established hierarchies. Education has not historically led events, it has responded to external events and demands to survive. In the case of hiring faculty, the hierarchy appears to be responding in the most minimally, legally acceptable way, i.e., it has dictated formal procedures, but the informal methods continue their domination. The strategy most frequently offered by women to break this pattern is to create "old girl networks" of their own. This writer perceives this as a separate-but-not-equal strategy, one which will have minimal impact until network members are in a sufficient number of key positions where relationships have developed over a number of years, e.g., thesis advisors or chair/head of departments in graduate schools. The most important variables are number of key positions and number of years in key positions. This leads to a familiar problem. How do large numbers of women obtain key positions necessary to meet the longevity criterion when they are outside the established interinstitutional informal networks? It is a problem which the hiring procedures developed in response to affirmative action legislation have not solved.

The previous discussion of the importance of access to and participation in interinstitutional informal networks might also apply to white males, especially those who are either on the job market for the first time or who find themselves one of the victims of reduced enrollments, tighter budgets, reallocation of resources, or the
shift to temporary, nontenure positions. In the first instance, the 
sheer expanding number of new doctorates dictates that thesis 
 advisors or chairs, even if using all the informal contacts at their 
disposal, cannot help all graduates. The majority are left to their 
other contacts, which are usually minimal at the beginning of an 
academic career. In the second instance, if the man's professional 
activity has been relatively high, some informal network can be used 
to locate potential positions. In both cases, competition would be 
heavy and any available informal contacts would be a useful edge. 
Without strong interinstitutional informal contacts, however, some 
of these men will find their options narrowed and perhaps have to do 
what most women have traditionally done: settle for jobs at less 
prestigious institutions, accept lower salaries, accept part-time 
positions, be hired at lower ranks, or withdraw from the competi-
tion in the academic world.

The access to and participation in informal networks does 
not, however, have direct cause and effect, i.e., personal contacts 
do not necessarily mean that one is assured of a position. The nar-
ratives of the faculty interviewed in this study about how they 
 obtained their present positions contain evidence that such cause 
and effect was true frequently in the past. Current employment 
conditions and hiring procedures now dictate that personal contacts 
may give one an opportunity to compete, sometimes with a distinct
advantage, through getting one's papers out on the top of the pile, being invited for interviews, or having advocates for the private, undocumented calls and conversations during which candidates are more candidly discussed. Thus, informal contacts may be considered frequently necessary, but not always sufficient, to obtain positions.

It would seem advantageous for those seeking faculty positions to at least be aware of the continuing presence and domination of informal networks in the hiring process. All graduate students and faculty members are, by definition, members of those groups, and have choices to make about their interactions with other members of their group and related groups, e.g., students with professors or faculty with administrators. The choice may be to develop a broad range of relationships with calculated goals in mind, to develop smaller cohort groups, and/or to remain outside their group and related groups altogether. Awareness of the potential impact of informal network contacts seems necessary so that, whatever the choice, it is an informed one where the ramifications are understood.

The hiring process in higher education could be described as one which relies heavily on sponsored mobility, applies particularistic and ascriptive criteria, and functions primarily as a closed system. Sponsored mobility is defined as a controlled selection process where those within the system choose whom they will allow
into the system. The implied goal of affirmative action legislation, as it relates to hiring practices, is to use formal methods exclusively, and thus allow contest mobility, use only universalistic and achievement criteria, and become an open system. This goal would appear—from the dominance of informal networks over time—to be unrealistic. Rather than the pretense of mutually exclusive categories which are labelled right, i.e., formal, and wrong, i.e., informal, recognition and use of informal networks in addition to formal procedures seem to be a necessary step. This would allow what has become covert use of informal networks to be a legitimate and useful overt part of the hiring process. At the very least, the higher education hiring process needs to be examined carefully and realistically, and further adjustments made.

Further Research

The researcher became aware, during the course of this study, of additional studies which would be useful and feasible. Some of them would have essentially the same general purpose, i.e., to determine to what extent and how informal networks function, but focus on different variables for key data analysis: (a) a study which examined variations in use of informal and formal methods by subject areas; there were insufficient sample numbers to explore the area in this study, but there were data which indicated the norms
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used in the hiring process may vary between fields because of such variables as department enrollments, changing research interests of the federal government, and changing perceptions of the university as to the role of various departments in the overall institutional goals; (b) a study which examined the differences in use of informal networks between the first, second, third, etc., job search; (c) a study which examined the differences in use of informal networks by level of teaching assignment, i.e., undergraduate exclusively, graduate exclusively, or a combination, and/or research responsibilities; (d) a study which examined how faculty couples use informal networks when seeking positions at the same institution or the same geographic location; and (e) a longitudinal study which followed several groups of doctoral graduates from the same department to determine similarities and differences in the informal network methods they used in seeking employment.

There also appears to be a need to address the problem of strategies for women and minorities to deal with the established interinstitutional informal networks. What is the success or failure rate of the separate "old girl network" and why? What are the underlying assumptions and goals of these networks? What are the common denominators around which these networks are formed? Are they concerned with the problems of academic members at all levels or are they establishing their own elite groups? What are
some new strategies which might be considered? How could their feasibility be tested? Occasional fragments of information related to these questions appear in newsletters and educational publications, but more thorough and systematic analyses are needed.

As suggested in the implications, in obtaining the data for this study discrepancies were revealed among policies written for the hiring process, documented procedures, and actual practice. That is not to say what is documented has not occurred, but that all that occurs has not been documented. Thus, studies which focus on both the covert and overt actions during the hiring process might discover the extent of these discrepancies.

Finally, this researcher believes studies should be attempted which apply the concepts used in network analysis to study the functioning of informal networks in the higher education hiring process. Although they have come primarily from anthropological studies (Boissevain & Mitchell, 1973; Mitchell, 1969; Whitten & Wolfe, 1973), the concepts and techniques have been expanded to examine the influence of personal relationships on individual's lives (Boissevain, 1974) and the importance of social networks as a variable in obtaining employment (Wolfe & Dean, 1974). The concepts and techniques associated with network analysis are complicated and sophisticated, but successful implementation of them in a study of informal networks in the higher education hiring process could help explain the long-
standing and continuing domination of informal networks.

Summary of the Study

The purpose of this study was to examine to what extent and how informal networks functioned in the past and now function in relation to the hiring process in higher education. The study was undertaken because of the relative lack of empirical data about hiring processes, the need for potential and current faculty to have an understanding of these processes, and the desire to relate the concept of sponsored versus contest mobility to the hiring process.

The design of the study was to collect data from a stratified random sample of full-time higher education faculty at a regional public university through personal interviews conducted by the researcher. Data were collected from 100% of the sample of 82, which was 10% of the accessible population (816). Nominal data were the primary level of measurement and analyses appropriate for nominal data were completed. First, summary frequency distributions were calculated for all variables. Second, either the one- or two-variable $X^2$ or Fisher's exact test was applied in testing the null hypotheses of the research hypotheses, using a probability of .05 for committing a Type I error (alpha).

Several results of the hypotheses testing were based on rejecting the null and accepting the research hypothesis with an
actual probability of .00 of falsely rejecting the null: (a) Informal contacts had been used more than formal methods in finding present positions; (b) Informal contacts would be used more than formal methods in searching for another academic position; (c) Informal contacts were believed to have the same or greater influence on the hiring process now than in the past; and (d) Faculty with high professional activity were more active as links in the informal network than those with low professional activity.

The following results of the hypotheses testing were based on not rejecting the null hypothesis and not confirming the research hypothesis; the exact probabilities of obtaining the given or more deviant data if the null hypothesis were true were all greater than .75: (a) Informal contacts were used by the same proportion of faculty during the expansion years and the tightening job market; (b) Informal contacts were used by the same proportion of women and men faculty; (c) Inbreeding, i.e., one or more degrees from the hiring institution, was a characteristic of the same proportion of faculty hired during the expansion years and the tightening job market; and (d) Activity on the academic job market was the same proportion for faculty with high professional and informal link activity as for faculty with low professional and informal link activity.

The major conclusion of the study was that informal networks have dominated the hiring process at the public university and continue
their domination. Informal networks were used by 73% of the faculty to find their present positions, were the preferred method of 80% of the faculty in searching for other academic positions, but would be used by 98%, and were perceived by 93% of the faculty as having the same or greater influence on the hiring process now than in the past. Informal networks were used consistently over time (1935-1971 = 74%; 1972-1978 = 71%) and by both women (79%) and men (71%). Inbreeding continued to function as part of the hiring process: through 1971, 24%; since 1971, 29%.

In addition, it was concluded that although faculty with high professional activity are more active as information links in the informal network, high professional and informal link activity does not result in any more academic job market activity than for those with low professional and informal link activity.

It was also concluded that personal contacts made during graduate school and with professional colleagues are the most important informal network groups, and phone calls and/or letters is the informal method most widely used. This remains true whether faculty are seeking employment, being sought for employment, or functioning as information links.

The final conclusion was that procedural changes in the hiring process which have occurred since 1972 because of legal requirements have not significantly reduced the dominant use of informal
networks.

The major implications were that informal networks will continue to dominate the hiring process; that one of the affirmative action goals, to reduce the influence of informal network activity in the hiring process, has not been reached; that women and minorities remain outside the established interinstitutional informal networks; that some white males also find themselves outside the established interinstitutional informal networks; that informal contacts are at the present time frequently necessary, but not always sufficient, in obtaining positions; that potential and current faculty should have an awareness of the impact of informal networks; and that the hiring process could be described as one which relies heavily on sponsored rather than contest mobility.
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Appendix A: Interview Schedule

A. _____ Interview number

B. Sex
   _____ 1. Female
   _____ 2. Male

C. Degrees earned; where
   _____ 1. B.A., B.S.
   _____ 2. M.A., M.S., M.Ed.
   _____ 3. Doctorate (Ph.D., Ed.D.)
   _____ 4. Other

D. How many full-time nine-month higher education academic positions have you held?
   _____ 1.
   _____ 2.
   _____ 3.
   _____ 4.
   _____ 5.
   _____ 6 or more.

E. When were you hired at this institution?
   _____ 1. May 1971 through February 1978
   _____ 2. May 1961 through April 1971
   _____ 3. April 1961 and before

F. At what academic rank were you hired?
   _____ 0. Lecturer
   _____ 1. Instructor
   _____ 2. Assistant Professor
   _____ 3. Associate Professor
   _____ 4. Professor

G. What is your current academic rank?
   _____ 0. Lecturer
   _____ 1. Instructor
   _____ 2. Assistant Professor
   _____ 3. Associate Professor
   _____ 4. Professor
H. Do you receive requests from hiring institutions to suggest potential candidates for higher education job openings?
   _____ 0. No. (If no, go on to M.)
   _____ 1. Yes. (If yes, complete I-L.)

I. Who makes these requests for suggestions?
   _____ 0. Not applicable
   _____ 1. Former professors
   _____ 2. Professional colleagues
   _____ 3. Former students
   _____ 4. Other friends or acquaintances
   _____ 5. Other (specify) ________________________________

J. How frequently do you receive these requests?
   _____ 0. Not applicable
   _____ 1. Once or more a week
   _____ 2. Once or more a month
   _____ 3. Once every few months
   _____ 4. Once or twice a year

K. Have the requests increased, decreased, or stayed about the same during the past six years?
   _____ 0. Not applicable
   _____ 1. Increased
   _____ 2. Decreased
   _____ 3. Stayed about the same

L. How frequently do you fulfill these requests?
   _____ 0. Not applicable
   _____ 1. Always
   _____ 2. Occasionally
   _____ 3. Never

M. Do individuals seeking new or different positions in higher education ask you for information about job opportunities?
   _____ 0. No. (If no, go on to S.)
   _____ 1. Yes. (If yes, complete N-Q.)

N. Who makes these requests for job opportunity information?
   _____ 0. Not applicable
   _____ 1. Former professors
   _____ 2. Professional colleagues
   _____ 3. Former students
   _____ 4. Other friends or acquaintances
   _____ 5. Undergraduate or graduate classmates
O. How frequently do you receive these requests?
   _____ 0. Not applicable
   _____ 1. Once or more a week
   _____ 2. Once or more a month
   _____ 3. Once every few months
   _____ 4. Once or twice a year

P. Have the requests increased, decreased, or stayed about the same during the past six years?
   _____ 0. Not applicable
   _____ 1. Increased
   _____ 2. Decreased
   _____ 3. Stayed about the same

Q. How frequently do you fulfill these requests?
   _____ 0. Not applicable
   _____ 1. Always
   _____ 2. Occasionally
   _____ 3. Never

R. In regard to other academic positions, do any of the following activities apply to you during the last three years: been approached about a job; submitted or been asked to submit credentials; interviewed?
   _____ 0. No.
   _____ 1. Yes. If yes, approximately how many times?
       _____ 1.
       _____ 2.
       _____ 3.
       _____ 4.
       _____ 5.
       _____ 6 or more.

S. What was the contact through which you first learned about a position at this university?
   _____ 1. Graduate advisor
   _____ 2. Other graduate professor
   _____ 3. Graduate department chair/head
   _____ 4. Graduate school classmate
   _____ 5. Undergraduate professor
   _____ 6. Faculty colleague
   _____ 7. Other professional friend
   _____ 8. Did nothing and was recruited
   _____ 9. College placement office announcement
10. Unsolicited letter sent by respondent/unsolicited phone call made by respondent
11. Professional association advertisement
12. Convention placement service
13. Commercial teacher's agency
14. Other advertisement
15. Other (specify) ____________________________

T. After you had applied for the position and before the interview, do you know if any personal contacts regarding the position were made on your behalf?
   0. No, I do not know.
   Yes. If yes, what was your professional relationship to the person or persons making the contact?
   1. Graduate advisor
   2. Other graduate professor
   3. Graduate department chair/head
   4. Graduate school classmate
   5. Undergraduate professor
   6. Faculty colleague
   7. Other professional friend
   8. Not applicable; no formal application procedure

U. After the interview and before you were offered the position, do you know if any personal contacts regarding the position were made on your behalf?
   0. No, I do not know.
   Yes. If yes, what was your professional relationship to the person or persons making the contact?
   1. Graduate advisor
   2. Other graduate professor
   3. Graduate department chair/head
   4. Graduate school classmate
   5. Undergraduate professor
   6. Faculty colleague
   7. Other professional friend
   8. Not applicable; job offer at interview or no interview

V. Let's assume tomorrow you had to begin looking for a different position in higher education. How would you go about it?
W. Do you believe the hiring process in higher education has changed over the years?
   ______ 1. No. If no, how is it the same?
   ______ 2. Yes. If yes, in what ways has it changed?
   ______ 3. Do not know.

X. I would like some information about your professional activities. (If vitae is available, quickly go through information with respondent to be certain the following areas are included.)

1. University professional activities
   ______ 0. None
   ______ a. Committee member:
   ______ b. Officer/chair:

2. State and national professional organization activities
   ______ 0. None
   ______ a. Member:
   ______ b. Committee member:
   ______ c. Officer/chair:

3. Publications and research activities
   ______ 0. None
   ______ a. Books, chapters in books:
   ______ b. Articles, reviews, monographs:
   ______ c. Papers presented:
   ______ d. Consultant and service contract products:
   ______ e. Current research activities:
Appendix B: Interview Schedule Codebook

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Variable No.</th>
<th>Item Variable No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Possible Responses</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Frame</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 1</td>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Identification number</td>
<td>Interview instrument</td>
<td>101-117</td>
<td>101-117</td>
<td>1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>201-207</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>301-333</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>401-409</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>501-513</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>601-603</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 2</td>
<td>LENGTH</td>
<td>Length of interview</td>
<td>15-70 minutes</td>
<td>15-70</td>
<td>4-5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 3</td>
<td>COLGE</td>
<td>College of interviewee</td>
<td>7-32</td>
<td></td>
<td>6-7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 4</td>
<td>PTCHD</td>
<td>Past chair/head of department/dean</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 5</td>
<td>PROAC</td>
<td>Professional activity index total</td>
<td>01-25</td>
<td>01-25</td>
<td>9-10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. 6</td>
<td>SEXI</td>
<td>Sex of the interviewee</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. 7</td>
<td>UNDGD</td>
<td>Undergraduate degree</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hiring institution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other institution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>Variable No.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Possible Responses</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Frame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>MAST</td>
<td>Master's degree</td>
<td>None, Hiring institution, Other institution</td>
<td>0, 1, 2</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>DOCT</td>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>None, Hiring institution, Other institution</td>
<td>0, 1, 2</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>TWOYR</td>
<td>Two-year degree from hiring institution</td>
<td>None, Yes</td>
<td>0, 1</td>
<td>10.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>HRGIN</td>
<td>One or more degree(s) from hiring institution</td>
<td>No, Yes</td>
<td>0, 1</td>
<td>11.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>LKGJB</td>
<td>Use of informal contacts and/or formal methods in looking for different position in higher education (content analysis coding, cac)</td>
<td>No comments, Use informal contacts exclusively, Use formal contacts exclusively, Use both: emphasize informal contacts, Use both: emphasize formal methods, Use both: no preference specified</td>
<td>0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5</td>
<td>12.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix B—continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Possible Responses</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Frame</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13. 13</td>
<td>INFML</td>
<td>Use of informal contacts with known recipients in looking for different position in higher education (cac)</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Would not use informal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Would use: phone calls (only)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Would use: letters (only)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Would use: conversation, calls, letters</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Would use: other methods specified</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Would use: no method specified</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. 14</td>
<td>FMPCL</td>
<td>Use of formal methods in looking for different position in higher education: phone calls and letters to unknown recipients (cac)</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Would not use method</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Phone calls (only)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Letters (only)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Phone calls and letters (both)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. 15</td>
<td>FMRDG</td>
<td>Use of formal methods: reading advertisements and listings (cac)</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Would not use method</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Read ads/listings</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>Variable No.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Possible Responses</td>
<td>Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>FMCPS</td>
<td>Use of formal methods: attend professional conventions to use their placement services (cac)</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Would not use</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Attend conventions to use placements services</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>NYHED</td>
<td>Unsolicited comments about leaving higher education</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Would/might leave</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>CHGHP</td>
<td>First response to V: &quot;Do you believe the hiring process in higher education has changed over the years?&quot;</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Do not know</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>LEGCH</td>
<td>Unsolicited comments about legal/procedural changes affecting outcome of the hiring process (cac)</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Little or no difference</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Some or great diff.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>EFFIN</td>
<td>Unsolicited comments about informal contacts affecting outcome of hiring process now (cac)</td>
<td>No comments</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Less or no influence now</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Same or greater influence now</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>Variable Name</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Possible Responses</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Frame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>NUJBS</td>
<td>Unsolicited comments about number of job openings in (this) field affecting current hiring process (cac)</td>
<td>No comments 0, No job openings 1, Fewer job openings 2, More job openings 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>CHGDG</td>
<td>Unsolicited comments about changes in degrees required affecting current hiring processes (cac)</td>
<td>No comments 0, More degrees required 1, Same or fewer degrees required 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Category**

| D. 23  | FTHED         | Number of full-time higher education academic positions                     | 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 or more | 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 or more | 28   |
| E. 24  | TMHRD         | When interviewee was hired at this institution                              | May 1971 - Feb. 1978 1, May 1961 - April 1971 2, April 1961 and before 3 | 1, 2, 3 | 29   |
## Appendix B--continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Possible Responses</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Frame</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>RKHRD</td>
<td>Academic rank when hired at this institution</td>
<td>Lecturer/No rank</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Asst. Professor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Assoc. Professor</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>RKNOW</td>
<td>Current academic rank</td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Asst. Professor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Assoc. Professor</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>RQCND</td>
<td>Does interviewee receive requests from hiring institutions to suggest potential candidates?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>WHORQ</td>
<td>Who makes requests for suggestions of candidates?</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Former professors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prof. colleagues</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Former students</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other friends/acq.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix B--continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Possible Responses</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Frame</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J.</td>
<td>29 FRERQ</td>
<td>How frequently are requests received?</td>
<td>Not applicable, Once or more/week, Once or more/month, Once every few months, Once/twice a year</td>
<td>0, 1, 2, 3, 4</td>
<td>34, 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K.</td>
<td>30 CHGRQ</td>
<td>Have requests changed during past six years?</td>
<td>Not applicable, Increased, Decreased, Stayed about same</td>
<td>0, 1, 2, 3</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.</td>
<td>31 IDINF</td>
<td>Does interviewee receive requests from individuals about job opportunities in higher education?</td>
<td>No, Yes</td>
<td>0, 1</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.</td>
<td>32 WHOID</td>
<td>Who makes these requests?</td>
<td>Not applicable, Former professors, Prof. colleagues, Former students, Other friends/acq., Ugrad/grad classmates</td>
<td>0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Possible Responses</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Frame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O.</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>FREID How frequently are requests received?</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Once or more/week</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Once or more/month</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Once every few months</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Once/twice a year</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>CHGID Have requests changed during past six years?</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Increased</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Decreased</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stayed about same</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>OTPOS Has interviewee been approached, submitted or asked to submit credentials, or interviewed during past three years for another higher education position?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>One time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Two times</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Three times</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Four times</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Five times</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Six or more times</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>CONT1 Contact through which interviewee first learned about a position at this university.</td>
<td>Graduate advisor</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>41-42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other grad. professor</td>
<td>02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Grad. dept. chair/head</td>
<td>03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Grad. school classmate</td>
<td>04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Undergrad. professor</td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix B--continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Possible Responses</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Frame</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty colleague</td>
<td>06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other professional friend</td>
<td>07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Informal: Other</td>
<td>08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>College placement office</td>
<td>09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unsolicited letter/unsolicited call</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prof. assoc. adv.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Convention placement ser.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Comm. tchr's agency</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other advertisement</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Formal: Other</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. 37 CONT2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Interviewee's knowledge about personal contacts made between application and interview</td>
<td>No, I do not know</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate advisor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other grad. professor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Grad. dept. chair/head</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Grad. school classmate</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Undergrad. professor</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty colleague</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other professional friend</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not applicable: No formal application procedure</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix B--continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Possible Responses</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Frame</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>CONT3</td>
<td>Interviewee's knowledge about personal contacts made between interview and job offer</td>
<td>No, I do not know</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate advisor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other grad. professor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Grad. dept. chair/head</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Grad. school classmate</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Undergrad. professor</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty colleague</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other professional friend</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not applicable: Job offer at interview or no interview held</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>LINK</td>
<td>Link activity</td>
<td>Collapsing categories FRERQ and FREID</td>
<td>3 = 1-3, 1-3, (High)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 = 4, 1-4 (Low)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 = 0, 0 (None)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>PROA2</td>
<td>Professional activity (Low, Medium, High)</td>
<td>Collapsing categories PROAC</td>
<td>1 = 0-12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 = 12.5-17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 = 17.5-25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>OTPO2</td>
<td>Other positions (None, Low, High)</td>
<td>Collapsing categories OTPOS</td>
<td>0 = 0 (None)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 = 1 and 2 (Low)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 = 3-6 (High)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category No.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Possible Responses</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>TMHR2</td>
<td>Time hired</td>
<td>Collapsing categories</td>
<td>1 = 1 on TMHRD 2 = 2 and 3 TMHRD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>CON11</td>
<td>Informal or formal: First contact for this position</td>
<td>Collapsing categories</td>
<td>1 = 1-8 (Informal) 2 = 9-15 (Formal)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>PRLI</td>
<td>Professional activity and LINK combined</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 = PROA2 is 1 (Low) and LINK is 1 (Low) 2 = PROA2 is 3 (High) and LINK is 3 (High)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>PREF</td>
<td>Looking for another position: Preferred use</td>
<td>Collapsing categories</td>
<td>1 = 1, 3 (Informal) 2 = 2, 4, 5 (Formal)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B--continued

Notes:

1. Categories A, B, and C: Transferred to Cover Page for keypunching and found under Variables 1-11.

2. Categories V and W: Coding of content transferred to Cover Page for keypunching and found under Variables 12-22.

3. Category X: Professional activity index total transferred to Cover Page for keypunching and found under Variable 5.

4. Category F: 0 code for "Lecturer" expanded to include also "No rank."

5. Categories L and Q: Omitted from coding and keypunching because of lack of variability of responses, i.e., all responses were "Always."
Appendix C: Cover Sheet for Interview Schedule

1. Interview ID number
2. Length of interview
3. College of interviewee
4. Past chair/head of department
5. Professional activity index total
6. Sex
   1. Female
   2. Male
7. Undergraduate degree (0 = None; 1 = Hiring institution; 2 = Other institution)
8. Master's degree (0 = None; 1 = Hiring institution; 2 = Other institution)
9. Doctorate (0 = None; 1 = Hiring institution; 2 = Other institution)
10. Two-year degree from hiring institution (0 = None; 1 = Yes)
11. One or more degree(s) from hiring institution
   0. No
   1. Yes
12. Use of methods: looking for other positions
13. Use of informal contacts: looking for other positions
14. Use of formal methods: looking for other positions
15. Use of reading advertisements
16. Use of convention placement services
17. Comments about leaving higher education
18. Hiring process change: no, yes, do not know
19. Legal/procedural changes affecting hiring process
20. Informal contacts affecting hiring process
21. Number of job openings affecting hiring process
22. Degree requirement changes affecting hiring process
Appendix D: Cross-Reference Identification Card

Name _______________________________ Interview number _____

Office:

Phone: ______________________________

Location: ___________________________

Hours: ______________________________

Appointment: __________________________

First contact: __________________________

Second contact: __________________________

Date interview completed: __________________________

Date interview refused: __________________________

Vita available: ( ) Yes ( ) No

Comments: ______________________________

______________________________
Appendix E: Responses to Two Open-Ended Questions

Responses to V: "Let's assume tomorrow you had to begin looking for a different position in higher education. How would you go about it?"

Responses to W: "Do you believe the hiring process in higher education has changed over the years?" (1 = No; 2 = Yes; 3 = Do not know)

Observation 1: V. First: Call people he knows in field (professional colleagues) and use contacts he's developed since he's been at university. Would do this not to "circumvent system"; "type of information is better through the informal route, because people who are called can tell more about the job."

Second: Write a few letters to places of interest to him.

W. (1) Within this department is an open system, i.e., faculty has privy to process, procedures, details about each position. Doesn't believe university generally is as open.

"We all use an informal system of communication, including job information, and it's the best system, especially when the best jobs are many times filled before they are advertised."

Obs. 2: V. Visible field for knowledge about one's work; word-of-mouth about best people and they are most sought after when jobs are available. His next move would be to major university, i.e., has only one more level to go in higher education. More job possibilities in this field than most fields right now.

Send vitae, etc., to job openings he's learned about through listings or word-of-mouth.

W. (1) "Specific aspects in this field will probably mean no or little change. Word-of-mouth is best way for anyone to find any job. Even letters of recommendations are losing credit because of 'open' policy. Some hiring institutions will call candidate and interview over phone so that nothing is down in writing; this method will probably increase in importance."
One-person hiring is changing to search committee from unit where person will be working.

Obs. 3: V. Call people he knows in higher education, i.e., former students, professional colleagues. With his specialty he "could move tomorrow," but lateral/upper moves for senior faculty are difficult because one has to be especially good. He might have to start on small campus and build a program. Knows about jobs that are not published yet.

Ads/professional journals: limited use, but might use to find out if some job might have been missed.

W. (2) Probably: don't want mass applications for positions in general field, so will call up professors (in specific area within general field) and ask them to recommend students. Personal friendship not a bad thing; do weigh heavily on credentials, but call letters of recommendations for personal response to candidates, i.e., do not rely exclusively on letters.

Much interviewing done at national convention, e.g., three openings in department last year and had 150 applicants for one position which was in a new field where everyone knows everyone "or their sponsor"; search committees have no budget to bring candidates to campus, although some candidates will pay their own way.

Built up PhD program on this campus in middle of "crunch"; may be trimmed back in future, but uncertain.

Obs. 4: V. Search professional journals with specific focus on his specialties; if going into academic administration would look at Chronicle; update resume.

Hasn't used professional colleagues/friends yet, but if in urgent situation would use friends to find out about positions not listed; by the time positions get into journals, a decision has been made about someone; sometimes they create positions when right man comes along.

W. (2) Has become more cumbersome because of federal regulations; problem is discrimination by sex, race; have to document every step; bureaucracy is time-consuming. But documentation, etc., hasn't helped, only made many decisions more difficult. Can't hire "on basis of personality--ability to
relate is critical--and may not be able to hire best individual for job because of minority considerations, i.e., have to give precedence to women or minority; in some cases the 'token' is promoted and it becomes difficult for them."

Obs. 5: V. First: Personal contacts with people he knows at different schools, i.e., graduate school classmates and professional colleagues.

Second: Employment brochures are useful as source of information; he used convention placement service when on job market after finishing doctorate.

W. (3) Doesn't think so: depends on special circumstances at school at any given time, i.e., courses needed at particular time and whether person's research fits in with emphasis of department or may want to balance emphasis rather than overload on that approach. Very tight job market in his field; most movement is in temporary positions with very few track/tenure positions open.

Obs. 6: V. Department chairman receives fliers from major universities--would leaf through those and New York Times ads--and send in materials when interested in a specific position. Has not known anyone at institutions he's applied to.

Current candidate at Eastern university and knows they have "called all over the country about me"; don't go by credentials, but by actual performance.

W. (2) Changed in his field--looking for proven success of a person rather than PhD which is switch--now back to non-PhD. Specific areas of field might require doctorate, but they're looking for skills.

Just about impossible for new graduate school person to get foot in door.

One hundred applications for current opening in department; if credentials are guarded, will call writer (because of open recommendations policy); people, i.e., those hiring and those writing letters, accept it as a legitimate way for getting more information than that on the letter itself.

Obs. 7: V. File with professional organization placement centers
and attend conventions; would not use Chronicle.

Would "tell everybody and anybody I am available and call people I know in higher education, especially major professors from PhD and MA."

Would consider going into industry.

W. (1) Tighter job market, but not sure it's changed in process. Not a lot of job openings; stable, but not much lateral movement.

Strong believer in "utilizing informal network: find them, use them; that's the way it works about 90% of the time; can use an intermediary--friend of a friend--who is credible. Need to find the point of contact."

Obs. 8: V. Professional convention has come to be known for initial recruiting for next academic year; begin to find out what schools are looking for new PhD's.

Stanford, Chicago, Harvard PhD's--their graduate professors would just call professional contacts; this happens at _________ (where he is going to finish PhD), also, but depends on preference professors have for specific graduate students, i.e., "who they want to promote as their stars." Negative side is that if you don't please major advisors you will not be suggested for candidacies, etc.

W. (1) Not in the three years he's been in it: hiring depends on whether the graduate faculty would recommend him to another school. Some information from professional association publications; conventions with some meetings, but main purpose is for recruiting and being recruited.

Two advertisements might be done to meet legal requirements, but hiring is still done in old way: who recommends whom.

Obs. 9: V. Let professional colleagues, i.e., chairman, staff, know he was looking for a job. Main method would be to telephone people he knows at schools with programs in his field to find out about jobs: would use more informal approach than formal approach.
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Just for referrals—who to call where—would check professional journal job listings.

W. (2) Has two masters and in one field would have to use formal route, but minimal to nonexistent chances of getting a job. In second field (where currently employed), would now use informal, i.e., personal contact with various chairpersons at different institutions and "Could I have someone call you?"

Obs. 10: V. Would begin with same method he got this position (first year; one-year temporary): write letters to all universities that had at least a master's degree program in his field; wait for responses and comply with requests.

Would ask graduate professors if they know of any job openings.

If no offers, would look for job in industry, but prefers higher education.

W. (3) Rumors are that it is much harder to get a job now than several years ago. He started his job search thinking 10 letters would do it and sent out 50; with this position personal contacts after he had written letter helped his candidacy. Knows of doctorates who have sent out as many as 250 letters with no responses for interviews; one PhD did this for three straight years—if not hired during first search you become less desirable. He feels fortunate that he had three interviews.

Obs. 11: V. Would read publications to find out about job openings, i.e., Chronicle, university bulletin, professional organization publications.

Most promising method would be using professional colleagues, i.e., even if he does not know that many people in field yet, they do, and a "friend of a friend" is useful in making contacts and getting your name out to people as a good prospect.

Would also attend professional convention, because it is common place for "mentors to bring budding PhD's" to introduce them around to their colleagues.

W. (1) Depends on level of job and degree held. Assuming a PhD, the process is the same: graduate advisor
from doctoral program and entire committee will be used as contacts in field, because they know best positions and could help candidate get an interview. With some positions there are "professional considerations--trade-offs and favors between institutions' departments."

Obs. 12: V. Would update credentials and contact professional organization placement service. Attend convention where they have 10-minute interviews and you need to be there first day to get a slot; "hate to have to depend on them for a job; everyone uses them, but it's like a livestock show."

While waiting for paper credentials would start making personal contacts himself: personal phone calls to colleagues--"what have you got? I'm available"--and personal phone calls to departments (without knowing chairman), based on geography or some program criteria.

W. (2) Has become extremely tight where PhD's go to lower spots; has made personal contacts the most important dimension of getting a job. Personal contacts are legitimate way to go--most common way to get jobs, but when tight job market exists, they are the only way.

Jobs available in early '70's and got tight in '74-'77; slight loosening now again (because of contacts he has developed), but not back to '60's markets; doubts it will ever be that way again.

"Pragmatic side" of higher education is not dealt with in any way during graduate school, e.g., financial state of State affecting university appropriations and thus salaries; job search processes.

Obs. 13: V. Read professional organization catalogue for positions available; at their conference only interviewed for about half of possible positions--jobs are often "written for specific people." Institutions looking at specific areas of specialization, degrees, and years of experience. Difficult to break into system, so would not rely on conventions or letters--would call up directly the chairmen of departments which had listings in catalogue.

W. (2) Wife (in same field with same degree) had more interviews than he, but no job offers, with sexual exploitation
from recruiters at conventions.

Affirmative action has made some changes, i.e., have to go through procedure, which is good, and more women are being hired, but still very few minorities. Job market is very tight with more people all equally qualified. Need to know people in field, so should keep in contact with undergraduate and graduate classmates as they work into departments around country.

Obs. 14: V. Would not look thru public advertising of any type---ignore totally.

Would call up and write to individuals he knows, i.e., colleagues, graduate professors, and friends, in the field. Would not use graduate classmates because they are not yet in positions to do any particular good.

Might consider doing something "more lucrative" outside of higher education.

W. (2) Real change, but changed grudgingly; the hiring people are from earlier regimes and very often resent strictures in hiring. Does not know anyone from his graduate school who got a job by writing to place with listed openings.

"Good old boy syndrome more difficult to maneuver now than it was in old days. Impression is that they'd prefer it the old way." Especially true in hiring of women. When he was hired here affirmative action had just begun to occur; chairman said, in reference to women and blacks, "We have to hire a couple of those, too." White male has better chance to make it in any field than anyone else. This may be useful and necessary, because "interaction of personalities, getting along in social group has importance." "Mechanical model offers equality, but has disadvantages; human model (personality and person's history) ignores equality, but has advantages." Believes there is a "Midwestern attitude" in these areas.

Obs. 15: V. Was in process of job hunting: had reactivated placement files; secured job descriptions through an agency prominent in his field for job placement; had called one former professor about job information.

Was using informal contacts at various stages in
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job-hunting process (was candidate for three positions): former classmate on one staff; colleague who waited to speak on his behalf after he was in last 20 being considered; interviewed at professional organization convention over drinks.

W. (1) It is a combination of who you know and what you know; exception is outstanding candidate with "impeccable" credentials and even for him it's hard to get to final process because he is so good they're suspicious. Personality is also important, i.e., how you relate to students, faculty, people in field; especially needed when higher education is fighting for survival.

Obs. 16: V. Use national organization meetings to establish professional (personal) contacts and look over their advertisements.

Primarily use informal contacts, specifically graduate professors and professional colleagues at this institution.

W. (2) Higher demand for doctorate in this field, where master's was sufficient as terminal degree before. Increased demand for "demonstrable competence, e.g., publications; spread is great between the idealized image for faculty and what they are in practice."

Informal contacts are primary in hiring process; the professional organization conference is really an informal base for job contacts and people keep attending to keep contacts active in case they have to begin job hunting.

Obs. 17: V. Write letters, send resumes; give them a month and if they had not responded would call directly if "really hungry" for a position (a particularly good position); would write follow-up letters to others, followed by a phone call.

To find out what is available, would use professional organization's placement roster which is published twice a year: this discipline is a "seller's market."

Summarized two steps: go through placement roster; then write to 2-3 people in field who are chairmen and let them know he's available and "do you know of any positions available?" Not out of school long enough to develop "inner circle" within profession of people in positions who have access to information.
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W. (1) Fairly stable process: sources of information
the same (people and placement rosters), procedures the
same, questions asked are the same. National professional
meeting has lots of recruiting going on—"hustler's haven";
separate room for placement; jobs are available and some
people go to meeting specifically to recruit and to be
recruited.

Obs. 18: V. Professional service in specific field has most com-
plete listings and much better than college placement centers
which send out general openings in field. Also would read
professional organization placement listings (yearly fee).
Personal contacts were (are) helpful; the man who called this
institution on her behalf knew her work over time. One-year
contract: so people during year on the staff have offered to
call on her behalf and this is quite helpful because of crowded
field at this time.

W. (2) Moving toward doctorate preferred in this field.
Advertising gives more equal opportunity. Credentials get
her the interview, but in final analysis it's the performing
ability; most institutions looking for someone young they can
hire cheap. They (hiring institutions) do make personal con-
tacts to check up on your performances over a period of time.

Obs. 19: V. Two major sources: Chronicle and professional
placement magazine; latter has good coverage of field, but
may be 'covering affirmative action laws only, with job-hiring
already done.' These have worked better for her than word-
of-mouth, because she doesn't "have the personal contacts
needed for word-of-mouth mechanism."

W. (2) At this institution in this department, "persistence and hanging around gets you a job." They also get
references for potential candidates through asking at other
universities about terminal degree students; one specific
institution is consistently personally contacted because they
have special emphasis which applies to this department.
Knows of "old boy networks" in other departments; seems to
depend on the degree-granting institution, e.g., California
and Michigan students were called by doctoral advisors with
job information contacts and her institution did not do that.

Obs. 20: V. Would check listings in professional national journals
and newsletter, as well as state organization's placement
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service. Go to national meetings and let people know she's available; let other universities know she's available through contacting personal friends who are chairmen and faculty members in her field.

W. (1) Many openings; expanding field within university. Being in higher education gives her good contacts at other institutions, because she can keep building on contacts in the field which is the main area or method of hiring.

Obs. 21: V. Would check ads in Chronicle and professional journals, as well as placement bureau from graduate school department, and write letters to different institutions. Would ask professional colleagues if they knew about job openings elsewhere.

W. (3) Finding ads, applying, submitting credentials, interviewing (as far as she knows). Doubts that old way of knowing somebody works anymore, because "through affirmative action, AAUP contracts, it's not legal; walk-in recruitment not possible."

Obs. 22: V. Read advertised vacancies in professional journals. Attend national conferences and register with employment clearinghouse: way of making initial personal contacts with other universities.

W. (2) Buyer's market--many more candidates vying for each opening and employers have greater choice. This decreases mobility. Have to have more extensive job search and take a position that doesn't meet all one's requirements.

Obs. 23: V. Reactivate file at this institution's placement office and check their listings; latter seen as formality to meet affirmative action requirements which "doesn't mean a thing." "People contacts are the most useful," i.e., word-of-mouth from friends now in university positions. "If someone likes you, and there's an opening, you get in." Letters on file used only when they need someone suddenly.

W. (1) "It's still who you know that is most important."

Obs. 24: V. Would talk to different people at this institution who are friends, i.e., counselor from master's program and graduate professors who are friends. (One-year contract was about to be completed.) The friends "look out for me." As
secondary move, would read job postings and placement bulletins from within this institution (wants to find another job at same institution).

W. (1) "If people know you and your work, if you have a good in, you can get a job fairly easily. A combination of who you know and how well you can do." If you're already in system (as student) and "they want to keep you around, they'll find a way. I've seen this in lots of different departments."

Obs. 25: V. Talk with department head who travels nationally and is aware of positions before they are posted. Attend and use professional organization convention's placement bureau for personal contact with potential hiring institutions. Look over professional journals' listings of job openings and advertisements.

W. (2) "Search" for people did not exist before or selection committees--it was one-man process. Still have final decision which is one man's decision, but now have committee that goes through applications, apply some criteria to rank candidates, and come up with list of people to be interviewed. Before there was only one person who did all this, usually chairman. Since union contract, department developed this procedure. What hasn't changed is that given all this procedure, it is only a recommendation; the final decision is the chair's (with dean's approval). Many faculty are concerned they're wasting their time with this procedure, i.e., "exercise in futility."

Obs. 26: V. Because placement papers are current, would first use information at hand: professional journals' job announcements, their placement listings, etc. Attend specific conference which is "job market conference" in this field. Call four or five friends and let them know he was available. Also call people who had contacted him before about jobs.

Probably consider leaving higher education and use skills in another setting.

W. (2) Tightening job market means greater selection of faculty possible. Affirmative action brought about changes, i.e., at least women will be considered and they may be hired. Requirements, i.e., terminal degrees, are the same + past experience. Same methods used to find out about jobs: "word-of-mouth" is main method for this field, i.e.,
placement by phone—"Who do you know?"

Obs. 27: V. Call up some friends and professional colleagues. If you work in prominent field with good people, they will have the needed contacts.

W. (2) Varies with the market: has become much more formalized; doubts that paperwork is changing how hiring is going on, i.e., more legal but "doesn't make a hell of a lot of difference"; still personal contacts which are the main thing. Hiring process depends on whether you're young PhD from less well-known, nonprestigious institution--they have to go more formal route--or from more prestigious institution where graduate advisors call their friends. Those who have been in the field develop contacts.

Obs. 28: V. Do "usual things": update credentials at placement office, vitae, letters of recommendations. Go through professional organization's newsletters and Chronicle, but would not anticipate too much information from them. Basic approach would be to start talking to people he knows--graduate committee chairman, professional colleagues, graduate classmates--and making them aware he's available; would call some and write letters to others.

W. (2) "Great deal": much more formal, i.e., series of steps that are explicit; terminal degrees completed are almost essential; most job descriptions require evidence of "past, ongoing, and planned research" or "completed, in progress, and proposed research". "Most jobs go by word-of-mouth"; law requires formal process, but, in reality, strong recommendations by influential person is more important. Whenever there are a number of applications, a couple will be obviously out; the ones who will be considered are those who are known or who someone knows someone. Might use link of that personal contact for confirmation about person. Will be "shoved to top of list by personal contact and knowledge rather than written application." This is taking less of a risk, because letters of recommendation difficult to trust. In this department they will call people they know.

Obs. 29: V. Call people he knows to see what's around; that would include professional colleagues from around the country and here. "Stinky" job market which is harder for older PhD's with rank/salary/tenure. Professional organization has free
advertisements; convention placement service, but largely ineffective right now.

W. (1) Process is probably the same, but success rate is lower. "Have to know someone who will pull your letter out of big pile of applications."

Obs. 30: V. If he left this institution, would not go to another higher education institution, but would switch fields. Jobs have to be geared to a specific basic philosophy with administrative leadership: wouldn't go into college just for job or "prostitute" himself. If any institution appeared compatible would visit and have personal conversations with people at that institution; now knows what questions to ask and that you "need to get to know the people." Would not send letters of recommendations or use placement service; would not submit self to interviews anymore.

W. (2) Just went through this "farce" for another position. "Old way" is no longer acceptable, i.e., way he was hired in mid-1960's on the basis of personal recommendations. Not sure change has been improvement; the long process, the "democratic" way of union contract policy, postings, affirmative action, departmental policy, may not bring about any better staff. There is a lot of "game playing, e.g., job descriptions that could be filled by only one candidate in the country; committees have to go through selection process with everything stacked, i.e., person is already chosen." Creates bitter feelings by those who participate in process.

Obs. 31: V. Would not look for another job in higher education--would do private teaching and go into semiretirement.

Need to "go after it" by pushing self on finding jobs; certain amount of "word-of-mouth" about abilities, because someone can have great credentials and not have needed skills. In this field push is toward more degrees.

W. (2) Department would like to have persons not necessarily with all the degrees, but push is on by university to have credentials. Department had two bad experiences with "highly qualified paper people" with no practical skills. Have to know about person's actual abilities.

Obs. 32: V. Go through professional journals and Chronicle.
Make direct contact with people at several institutions to find out about job openings: people are former undergraduate and graduate classmates; professional colleagues; administrators who have changed locations and have good programs.

W. (1) Not the broad spectrum of hiring: if someone in higher education wants another individual, they'll make personal contacts and ask for their recommendations. Affirmative action has meant more rigorous multiple steps put into effect, but political reference process still plays a great part in the whole process; has seen this when serving on search committee.

Obs. 33: V. Use personal contacts he's developed throughout the years from across the country--this would be the major way. A cohesive group developed during graduate school which has maintained contacts and knows about many jobs. Would do routine update of file. "It would be devastating to look for a job right now; even the best people pay their own way to interviews."

W. (2) He always went through formal procedures; only got one job on strength of someone else's recommendations. Market has changed, i.e., up and down, over the years; right now "buyer's market." Was department chairman during high enrollment period when they were "looking for warm bodies" and paid for interview visits. Now Ivy League school grads among the candidates at this institution, as well as other prestige schools, all highly trained. Search process is the same: friends or contacts; letters; Chronicle. Now need to appear at places where jobs are open; get across the qualities that you can't get down on paper.

Obs. 34: V. Go through professional organization's placement service listings. Would talk to "boss" here who knows everyone in the business and knows about any job openings around the country.

W. (2) Administration doesn't offer stability in new positions, because they don't want new faculty to get into tenure stream; offer temporary positions primarily. Problem when program requires continuity. More candidates, but doesn't seem to result in higher quality staff, i.e., best people won't remain temporary. Already know they won't be hired permanently if they haven't been offered tenure track.
Obs. 35: V. Start writing to friends who are in influential positions in higher education: contacts made over the years, i.e., former students, professional colleagues, undergraduate classmates. Update credentials with professional association and use their convention placement service. Would be more selective now about geography and program, but probably would not move now. Instead, take early retirement and do something else.

W. (1) Administration used to lean more heavily on placement facilities to find potential candidates. Other than that, process hasn't changed that much in the last 20 years, i.e., "personal contacts and friends are how you get your positions." Doesn't see anything wrong with that--have more compatible faculty. Chair begins search with initial screen--with personnel committee also weeding through some applications--until down to two who are invited to campus. Have been instances where faculty has not liked the wife--"a pushy wife might work to his detriment rather than advancement."

Obs. 36: V. Would go about it in as many ways as possible. Primary way: contact colleagues and acquaintances and do it as broadly as possible knowing that "personal contact is the only way that would work; do others (professional organization's 'slave market' publication, Chronicle) because of 1% chance of getting job in other ways--outside chance that blind application might work."

W. (1) Minor changes, such as affirmative action, with law that you have to advertise. Essentially nothing has changed--you still get that person you really want or need; departments have particular needs and know where best people would come from in that field. Pick the top three people and then go through and meet needs of the law. At the annual meetings people ask for recommendations from other people who are highly regarded in the field.

Obs. 37: V. Write to graduate advisor because of his many contacts in the discipline; he would know about openings, could find out, or would advise on the next move. He would be the principal contact because through the years he has kept contact with his doctorates and general job openings. Also would inquire about jobs through friends at other institutions. Approach might vary with circumstances, i.e., if laid off or if trying to move up to better school.
W. (1) Jobs at better institutions are rarely posted; word-of-mouth, calling, writing amongst friends about these jobs. The traditional forms of hiring: people call graduate department offices or person known in field and ask for recommendations of emerging doctorates as candidates; national conventions (less hopeful now, but people still go there looking for jobs); professional newsletters and placement sheets; making "informal contacts with anyone you can think of--or know."

Obs. 38: V. Knows of job openings through association in his professional field; would contact people personally through phone calls. Would like to stay in higher education because there is more academic freedom than high schools and have time to be involved in other activities.

W. (2) With Title IX, women and blacks are at least considered for positions and more likely to replace women with women, blacks with blacks. The more people you know, the better chance of getting a job. Knowing directors, department heads, etc., quite influential in hiring choices.

Obs. 39: V. Given his rank, he'd pick section of country he wanted to live, then register application with professional association which indicated desired location and send resumes to appropriate job openings. Might go through conventions, but not especially successful method. Jobs are available in this field.

W. (2) More formal: more positions than people; have to find them earlier; need to advertise and meet affirmative action guidelines. Informal methods of the past: before you could register position at convention or pick up phone and call a friend at another university to ask about possible candidates. Now takes much longer. Still, however, if someone had a personal contact at the hiring university he would have an edge; phone calls would be made about "how was he" as faculty colleague which would give information about collegiality. Need early plans for staffing to get best people; in this field there are more schools than candidates at conventions so limited number of candidates to interview. If don't find candidates at early conventions, quality goes down.

Obs. 40: V. Would review Chronicle, professional organization's placement materials, and attend national conventions in field or related fields--conventions are useful method. Would
contact major professor from graduate school and colleagues he's taught with who are now in administrative positions. Big thing is getting the word out that he is available.

W. (2) More formal because of affirmative action's equal rights employment: there are defined steps of procedure for both candidate and institution. Before it was more casual where you found someone you thought was good, usually by contacting your major professor or someone you knew in field; very little advertising at that time. "Informal, folksy kind of process" when he was hired; market was a seller's market then. ¹

Obs. 41: V. Start making phone calls to people he knows. Approach people from other institutions about jobs--contacts he's made since teaching at this institution.

W. (2) More regimented now; lower administration looks for people who would "fit." "Grapevine approach" gets name out and around that you're available. First-job people at a definite disadvantage--need to be in a position. (This is new phenomenon in last 10 years.) Temporary jobs are easier to get, but tenure jobs harder. More new people interested in this field and need experience to match credentials.

Obs. 42: V. Begin with job newsletter: give reasonably detailed job descriptions. Might attend national conference specifically to look for job. Basically would contact people he knows in this field and ask them if they knew of any job openings.

W. (2) Jobs are moderately scarce in this field, but a PhD in this field probably could find work and even be somewhat discriminating. Because of affirmative action you have to advertise every position. The "old boy network" had a lot to do with job hiring in this field until late 1960's; best and most prestigious jobs were personal communications; still some of that, but not as much. Documentation required for everything, but probably not consistency of method in that could still be influenced by who one knew, who the department chairmen

¹Implications: low mobility and relationship to faculty morale because expansion patterns no longer prevalent. Stimulation needed for productivity of faculty.
knew and liked. Rules have made the process more open and democratic in this department and definite push in the formal process direction.

Obs. 43: V. Depends on specific job area he was looking at; would read over previous positions offered at conferences he's not attended for general overall descriptions. Would go to some conferences, which are official clearinghouse for contacts. Would ask professional colleagues he knows in various other universities whether they know of openings there or elsewhere.

W. (1) Half of the positions are never advertised or maybe "fuzzily" advertised. Good positions were always hard to get, primarily because of exchange of scholars at highest prestige schools. Economic crunch is more obvious and can be used as excuse for not hiring, with some departments boasting that they're supporting other departments and could "wipe them out" by changing requirements. The whole process is "underhanded"; by time positions are advertised, usually someone has already been hired. If you're searching for a job from a tenured position you're at an advantage because can make contacts on strength basis; puts new entrants into severe disadvantage.

Generally, senior professors will make contacts for their candidates and will recommend them to other senior professors and department chairs--this exchange starts at prestige schools and then candidates filter down system as top jobs are filled with each other's candidates. Some candidates will go where the money is, e.g., hard science people would more likely come from prestige schools but not mind working at less prestigious institution if money and project(s) are there. Humanities staffs are harder to justify in larger society because they don't generate money.

Obs. 44: V. Would probably "short circuit the system" and call people to try to get a reading about job possibilities by using a direct approach; would try to determine key person and call that one person. Would use vitae, etc., only if not that anxious to move. Might consider going into industry.

W. (2) Everything takes longer, but more democratic and better system, i.e., not just unilateral department chair decisions. Before latter would informally talk with staff and then make his own decision; a current candidate was judged
2nd best of 25 applicants by four people and candidate will make presentation before area group votes and recommends to executive committee. Candidate needs to have political skills, because in criteria system it comes down to personal judgments.

Obs. 45: V. Use personal contacts by writing personal letters to 10-15 department chairs he knows well (former students, professional colleagues) and "call in his markers." Would bring placement papers up to date, but doubts it would do much at his age. Would NOT use Chronicle.

W. (2) Now are required to have "dossier as opposed to vitae and PhD done rather than ABD." More formal procedures. Affirmative action influence in terms of competition: with two people of same ability, the black or woman will get the job. Committee procedure for screening applicants--their recommendations given to chair, back to committee, person comes and meets faculty and students; terms of offer are put in writing right away.

Informal methods still significant in hiring. "Market" time is at convention where personal contact and recommendation play big role. Even now when hiring, in addition to advertising, will call chairmen and ask for names they should be considering, to put their name in "the hoppers." Informal probably still influential because of "professional bonding"; following World War II maybe 7-8 universities were turning out PhD's in this field and chairmen all knew each other; "power points" today still fit into that pattern of a "fraternity" or "family." It is less as the particular group reaches retirement age and are reduced in "effectiveness."

Obs. 46: V. Make contacts with professional peers and acquaintances: let them know he is available. They have the contacts in the field where contacts are needed. Placement offices are mostly "clerical"; do not place higher level jobs.

W. (2) Changes because of market: when it's seller's market, placement offices can be relied on; when it's buyer's market, for every job there are 30 applicants. In the latter situation the applicant must depend on informal contacts with professional peers. Process is the same, i.e., informal contacts are the key, but even more important and prevalent now in a buyer's market. Need to be at the right place at the
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right time.

Obs. 47: V. Update resume; screen announcements in journals, Chronicle; apply by letter. "If I get desperate" would attend annual professional organization's meetings where they have booth for job openings. Would make personal contacts with people in higher education who are influential and let them know he was looking; this approach not looked on as favorably as it once was because of affirmative action.

W. (1) Changes are the red tape because of affirmative action, i.e., obliged to announce openings more frequently, more careful and cautious in screening and rejecting candidates. Used to be professor to professor, but now jobs are tailored for the individual, so actually using same practices and processes. People don't want to take chances that they don't fit "criteria." "New breed" good for expanding establishment, but not in stable or declining fields; hard sciences in graduate areas cannot afford to have people moving in and out when they aren't given tenure because they "don't fit into the system"; too large of an investment of time and energy of tenured staff for that kind of turnover.

Mobility not available in higher education right now; lowered enrollment, tight budgets; staff spots filled with fresh graduates at lower level, e.g., would fill a professor position with assistant professor with no tenure. Would go into industry rather than higher education if he had to do it again, because of more security. Can't go into industry now because same process goes on there, i.e., lower "rank," lower salary, higher risk.

Obs. 48: V. Call friends around the country who are in touch with the current job market; these friends are professional colleagues, some in influence positions, e.g., chairs, heads. Professional organization would not serve him at this point, because their job emphasis is at junior position level; even if they listed something he was interested in he would probably have heard it from other sources. Would not use the Chronicle.

W. (2) Personnel committee (temporary spots) and search committee (higher ranks) now used where before the head was the main person responsible for hiring. Radically different in that before one could get a job on demand and now market is very tight. Job movement or "shifting around" was
normal career path procedure, but not possible with over-
expansion in higher education. This department has done very
little hiring, except for a few replacements which are usually
parttime and temporary. Has "currently--and always--kept
out of departmental activities."

Obs. 49: V. Probably would not look for another job in higher edu-
cation; would go on unemployment. Only possible way would
be to write to some friends; has gotten to know a lot of people
as he has travelled around the world. High rank, especially
research professors with high salaries, would make job hunting
difficult: institutions are looking for people at lower levels.

W. (1) Jobs are getting tighter, but that is only differ-
ence. "Depends on how well you fit into ongoing power struc-
ture and at the same time bring as much prestige to the insti-
tution without threatening the established herd." In this
department the faculty has quite a bit of power and they're
hiring junior faculty who fit into their long-term needs/
projects; the junior faculty have to "keep clean" for 5-6 years
until tenure is given. Have to be careful because there are
"degrees of freedom for faculty"; as part of "larger cultural
system there are rules, i.e., administration growing, faculty
develops pyramid/power in AAUP, which leaves no time for
study and basic functions of university." Higher education may
always have been that way, but it isn't what he thought it was,
i.e., seen as upwardly mobile route. It turns out people who
do more of the same in parallel kinds of bureaucracies.

Obs. 50: V. Not going to do it without knowing people: if not known,
need to get self known, perhaps by physically moving around
through a research project. Would not use application blank
or blanket area with resumes. Professional association clear-
inghouse of jobs in field is last ditch spot which is used only if
you are new or unknown in the field. Might look through ads in
Chronicle (doesn't know if they are valid or not), New York
Times; professional magazines.

W. (2) Changed from seller's to buyer's market. Process
is more formal than before; must have documentary proof of
process if hiring people are questioned; does not think the
result (faculty hired) is much better. The "best way of hiring
violates affirmative action, i.e., people who have worked
together who know each other or someone they worked with."
Some of these people will not go through the formal procedures
now required.

Obs. 51: V. Professional organization runs placement service in addition to conference and send out a monthly listing which is current and good source of information. Would register at professional meeting. Basic way would be to write letters to people he knew, particularly department chairmen he met when interviewing for jobs before he came here. Might write some blind letters to department chairmen, also.

W. (2) Changed in kind of market; i.e., now buyer's market. More paperwork at administrative level, largely because of affirmative action; more extensive search; these things are good, but different in that it used to be people asking others, "How does this guy look?" Being personally known is still factor in hiring; people looking will go by anything--personal information--that they can get about a candidate. Can get important leads about available people on basis of personal contacts. Believes this department uses a democratic process in hiring; includes faculty.

Obs. 52: V. First choice and best method: contact colleagues from universities where he has taught previously. Bring records up to date; attend professional organization's meeting which lists positions and is the marketplace for positions, but more people than positions.

W. (1) "Best positions obtained through word-of-mouth and listing is usually last resort." Still hit-or-miss type of thing--young PhD's often helped by graduate advisor or chair and after that first position on their own to learn about and find positions. (Harvard now sending out list of their graduates in this field.) "People laid off for economic reasons get help from the department chair about possible other position."

Obs. 53: V. Use graduate school's placement service, which sends computer listing of job openings, and cross-reference with openings listed in Chronicle. Would call graduate advisor if listings didn't work. He knows where jobs are before you're let into the program, so he tailors individual programs to openings. Might take sabbatical and try working outside of higher education for a year; then could decide if he wanted to make that a permanent option.

W. (2) Increase in applications, decrease in number of
positions. Understands that others look in *Chronicle*, etc., and go into mass mailings. Before it was "so and so wants to see you at ____," primarily personal contact, but not aware of it going on now because of no jobs in this field.

**Obs. 54: V.** "Most efficient" method is letting friends know he was looking for a job and available; friends are professional colleagues in same area from around the country. Read employment bulletins of professional organizations and *Chronicle*. Attend three relevant conventions; all have placement services and are good source of job information.

W. (1) Procedures the same except for women and minorities, i.e., more active recruiting of them in this field and willingness to hire them at decent salaries. Lists of candidates developed by "knowing someone here or knowing someone who knows someone; large percentage of staff is found this way." Committee goes through these lists to select and invite candidates to campus. If looking for new PhD graduate students to hire as assistant professor, would attend conventions, collect letters, and contact colleagues at other institutions. Different process for those below assistant, i.e., temporary, parttime; no terminal degree required, usually local graduate student or community people; handled by chairman alone.

Recent applicants to this department: woman applicant whose graduate advisor at another institution is close friend of faculty person; applicant whose graduate classmate/friend was on faculty and knew another professor on the staff; woman applicant whose graduate advisor at another institution was pushing her to come here as some type of "trade-off"--highly qualified and being sought by other schools. Good market in this field for seller; "with right credentials have good job opportunities."

**Obs. 55: V.** Salary and rank increase decreases mobility. Start line of communication by making phone contact with other people he already knows in the field, i.e., professional colleagues and friends; focus on specific geographical areas; if nothing available there, might leave higher education. Would not go his original route of sending out masses of unsolicited letters. On first job his graduate advisor told him about the job opening with a late night phone call; he sent a night letter to institution and was called the next day.
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W. (2) Market is flooded, but jobs are out there and person has to be aggressive. More formalized process: more committee setups, more democratic. Partially due to unions, etc. More fair, but less expedient and not sure the quality is any better. "Quick method" is frequently considered and done to follow up on letters of recommendations, but done less than before.

Obs. 56: V. Read advertisements in Chronicle; reactivate placement file from graduate school. Talk to current chairman and dean and other professional colleagues about possible job openings: basic way to get information.

W. (1) Process hasn't changed; shortage of people when she was hired and if hiring person had had a friend, the friend would have gotten the job, but just because of shortage, qualified people had a chance to break through the informal contacts. Informal contacts are the way hiring is done. Friends ask friends--from graduate classmates, graduate students, professional colleagues.

Obs. 57: V. Pick geographical area wanted to live in and go directly to hiring person for an "informational interview," i.e., face-to-face meeting before bothering with credentials. Has worked for her so far. Utilize contacts through current area director, chairman of department, vice president of area; all and any contacts that friends have are "better than sending faceless resumes."

W. (2) Educational requirements in this department have gone up, i.e., PhD almost necessary; competition stiffer with lots of well-qualified people available now. Affirmative action has made a big change: given women and minorities more opportunities; "serves to bring hiring underground," i.e., will post positions to meet federal law and go through the required process, while they already know who they want to hire. "The games we play are different now." Affirmative action does give committees clout to ask for women to replace women and may reduce game playing, but women and their committees may use exactly the same processes.

Obs. 58: V. Would probably go back into high school teaching. Has kept resume up, taken courses; would read journals and use convention placement services; has master's in field where
openings exist. Would contact friends in field and professional colleagues for the search process, but not try to use them for final interview.

W. (2) Affirmative action makes hiring less personal and more professional; could not get job here now the way she did. Has worked on search committees over the years and seen the changes. You cannot actually get a job through informal channels now, but you can still find out about them that way.

Obs. 59: V. Write unsolicited letter to small area college; also call community college where she knows head of specific department who was on university staff. No use reading AAUP bulletin because they list few openings and those require terminal degree. Because she doesn't have terminal degree, probably would not even look for another job; basically thinking about doing something else outside of higher education.

W. (2) Extremely informal before: came to work without contract; verbal agreement. Now head sends memo to all faculty and credentials of candidates are circulated before he arrives with some information about him and then he's available for interview. Still no faculty vote, but could tell head reactions to candidate.

Obs. 60: V. Write to appropriate departments at other institutions and try first for people who know her through work, conferences, correspondence through the years. If she knew people she'd written to, would follow up the letter with a phone call and try to arrange a personal meeting.

W. (2) Much more difficult--fewer openings, more rigorous routine in that faculty have a voice and department heads not alone in decision making. However, decisions are not much better. "Good old boy network" still operating in hiring. More education required or some kind of experience; used to find good people and train them.

Obs. 61: V. Read Chronicle and other appropriate journals for job listings. Update credentials and references. Send letters of inquiry to unknown people where jobs are listed and ask for application. Contact some of the people she's worked with in higher education (committees, professional organizations, professional colleagues) about openings or more specific
information about jobs listed--need to understand more about jobs. Difficult to move because husband on staff at same institution.

W. (2) More faculty involvement--search committees more active than before. Discussion of paper credentials as well as people who knew of them and their reputation as an educator. Not as likely that she could now be hired in the way she was. Parttime not as heavily screened as fulltime.

Obs. 62: V. Use personal contacts: primarily people she's met from around the country during post-doctoral fellowships. Practically only way to find jobs in this field. Professional organization has three bulletins and annual convention; no jobs.

W. (2) When hired undergraduate enrollment was high and department was thinking about establishing a doctoral program; the next year undergraduate enrollment dropped by 40 percent. Right now it is just more impossible to find jobs in higher education. Knows of 15 fully qualified friends with PhD's who cannot find jobs; nothing at all on the East Coast and people are giving up the search. Women with specialties in Women's Studies are occasionally hired--they are very young, some publications, strong graduate school and hired where there is strong male chauvinism.

Obs. 63: V. Looked for job openings through professional association's bi-monthly publications, but would not move now because nearing retirement and other positions would probably be temporary and no guarantee job here would be open or the same.

W. (2) This department run on expediency and hiring done on that basis, i.e., parttime, no tenure, one-year appointments. Lots of inbreeding for these positions, i.e., Master's students, because they will accept low salaries. When hiring a new chairman, people were listening in on phone calls, holding secret forums, and having secret votes. Example of faculty input, but how valid is it? "Go through rigamarole of democratic process, but in end it is not the people's choice." "Jobs or job information obtained by professional colleagues talking with each other; names are passed throughout the system; can also be blackballed through the same system!"
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Obs. 64: V. Read professional journals. Write chairmen of departments at certain universities and send papers: this method had good responses in the past during the expansion years; identifies openings. Contact friends from undergrad-uate and graduate school, but prefers not to use this method.

W. (2) Unsolicited letters, placement services, professional journal ads might or would still work in identifying openings. Now you need a "friend of a friend" among the hiring person(s) to discriminate among equally qualified can-
didates.

Obs. 65: V. Would retire and accept another position outside of higher education. Would make personal contacts at conven-
tions: professional association is close-knit group and has tight network; also, he edits journal in his field so is part of communications network. "It always helps if you know some-
one; if a job is open, specific people are contacted about the job."

W. (2) In this field majority of contacts and interviews take place at state, district, and/or national convention. Have job service bureau that is very active. There are more com-
mittees, especially since collective bargaining; depends on departmental policy, but usually at least screening process by personnel committee. More activity in search committees, i.e., assigned responsibility of going out and looking for some-
one, a job that used to be at higher administrative levels. People are screened down to a few candidates (or sometimes one is hired) before the job is posted OR job description is very specifically written. All of this is done to meet require-
ments of affirmative action, Title IX, Title VI. Graduate assistants are in good position to move into faculty at this institution in this department; also good way to hear and find out about jobs.

Obs. 66: V. Would not use a teacher's agency anymore. "Blanket" schools with information about self through letters and phone calls to people both known and unknown. "Personal contact is far more helpful than correspondence."

W. (2) Not looked for job, but assumes hiring process has changed (more legal requirements, while personal con-
tacts still used). Harder to get a job now, because lots of people in this specific market, i.e., any position would draw
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about 100 applicants, so it's an employer's market.

Obs. 67: V. Would make personal contact with people he's worked for and with: contact them himself if he knew them quite well; if he didn't know them as well might have someone else call for him. "Personal contact is the way jobs are generally obtained in this field. It's who knows who; known will get the job over the person who isn't known. Personal contact is the door-opener."

W. (2) "It's who you know. Personnel committee uses personal contact comments about people being considered for positions." Biggest change in last 10 years is minority hiring in this field; in the last 3-4 years Title IX has affected women's rights in hiring. Academic degrees becoming more important: people who've been here long time are locked into position (or highest is associate) without doctorate.

Obs. 68: V. Wouldn't look for another higher education position: no terminal degree so chances are "nil." Would go to public schools. Biggest selling point is selling self, no matter how many degrees. Recommendations from former employers; good jobs available if you can sell self. "Have to assert your individuality; need to know where line between destructive and negative aggression and assertion is."

W. (2) "People before looked at more as individuals; now degree is first criterion and even outstanding teachers are not promoted on that basis--it's based on publish or perish. Both faculty and administration have fostered this development." Former is reflection of larger society's concern with degrees, competency-based diplomas, 4-track systems in high schools. This campus has grown: used to be more a big family and now too impersonal even at departmental level; before "if (a past president) said you were hired, you were, no questions asked," now it's "committee stuff."

Obs. 69: V. "Consult with friends in academe rather than throw self on the job market. With my rank and degree personal contacts would be the only way to find a job." There has been an oversupply of overqualified instructors in this field since 1969.

W. (1) At professional association convention the placement service, interviewing, "slave market" hiring used to take
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place there for graduate students and professors who wanted to move: no positions now, e.g., in 1972 an "extremely well qualified" professor sent out 350 applications and received one reply. Basic method may not have changed (department chair and executive committee act on a "felt need basis"), but now positions are parttime, temporary only.

Obs. 70: V. There are "age constraints." Three avenues possible: call friends, "This is what I'd like; do you have something that fits this?"; pick geographic spots; use existing channels, such as Chronicle, to find out about openings, then find out if you knew anybody there, call them and get a "fix" on the situation.

W. (2) "Very definitely. Decision making was collegial affair, where recommendations were made by people who knew people seeking position. It was a collusion between dean, department chairmen, and senior professors. They would call each other about candidates and one was pre-selected. Much depended on perception of senior professor as to quality of people in their programs. It was an era of individuality with individual development, but now back into mass production even for delicate positions--our quality controls are gone."

Used to be "family of scholars" (before mid-1950's) where everyone knew each other nationally; with size came depersonalization and more objectivity which is a breaking down of relationships. Now have many rules and laws which create structures and requirements intended to produce objective criteria. Now faculty vote on new faculty and "may not have ability to, because it requires perception of what they might be able to accomplish and only highly competent could want the highly unusual because he is too competent and would be a threat; faculty might not even be aware of it or want to admit it to themselves." People hiring still have to rely on other people's perceptions for qualities, behavioral characteristics, attitudes which papers don't show, i.e., "Do they get along?" Some want to continue personal contacts and do through national and regional meetings, so there still are phone calls made about individual candidates.

Obs. 71: V. If serious, would find schools with department size and courses interested in and apply to those schools via unsolicited letter. Professional association has "slave market" at convention meetings where he could meet first-hand with institutional representatives; would use that method. Might use
casual verbal personal contact to find out about job openings, but not able to be main variable because of formal requirements. Would look at industry: has two specific skill areas which he could use.

W. (2) "Dramatically." Example of hiring situation two years ago where first had to post position for two weeks within university and "any janitor could apply," then send job description to scientific journals; a second job opened up (in June for next fall) where applicants for first position were eligible, but department had to go through entire cycle again. At the same time six coaches were hired without going through advertisements, which seemed inconsistent. There is a restrictive "time requirement to meet legal and formal procedures," especially for last-minute job openings.

What hasn't changed is people calling others about applicants to find out if there are additional comments, etc., to add to formal letter. Personal contact is another source of information; might ask others from same department as applicant who were not asked to write recommendations. Letters alone work only if writers are known to job hirers and writers have credibility.

Obs. 72: V. Keep looking at publications which list positions in other institutions and then make inquiries by writing without formal application or might require telephone calls. Get in touch with those who could assist him by calling or writing on his behalf. Would see if he knew anyone who was "influential" at a specific institution who might help him get a job or might know about jobs. Should revise vita for each specific job; most are too vague when they should key into specifics, i.e., "particularize your qualifications."

W. (2) More competitive; more people seeking jobs with reduced number of jobs available. Too few people make any effort to find out job particulars and relate to those. "People have used influence in viable ways; increasing number of personal contacts because you can't trust what you read--privacy acts, Civil Rights acts, conditions of employment, makes one very careful about what is put in writing. More likely to be open to questions asked over the phone." "Women are being included in interviews with no intention of hiring them; have to meet legal requirements; that's why phone calls work better than letters."
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Obs. 73: V. Update credentials from graduate school; get letters of recommendations from "role" people, i.e., chairman, dean. Send letters to chairs in various departments, because "they help each other." In search committee for department chair-
man and other positions, phone calls among peers gave leads and recommendations. "If you know anyone who knows or has worked with candidates, get on the phone and call. This is the best source of information. If you don't know someone, try to find someone who does." Inbreeding, or hiring of own gradu-
ates, on occasion has not worked; not too much in favor of it.

W. (2) Tight field now where there are 75 or more applicants for each position. Must publicize each opening so you "don't get in through back door anymore, because influence of search committee is stronger." Last minute hiring is less, which is improvement, but even during last five years it has still happened. In past, department chair personally sought out staff he wanted to build the department. Personal calls and contacts about candidates still operates, although trying to be more democratic; people want to go beyond vita. Later in year you wait (because of money commitments, etc.), more people "have been picked over pretty well" and have to rely then totally on personal contacts.

Obs. 74: V. Use advertisements in professional journal; send around curriculum vita; attend national meetings to have inter-
views: hiring is fairly well organized now. Would not use informal network systematically, because it puts people on the spot, but might ask friends and colleagues casually if they knew of job openings.

W. (2) The department offices' head or chairs used to be main contact for matching candidates and jobs. Did hiring in 1960's and used every method to pull people into the institution; the principal problem was recruitment and he acted as channel of information. "Great reduction in old boy network; used to be utterly dependent on personal contacts and now they may be used as much, but dominant system is legal recruit-
ment procedure; it is dominant because you have to go through it. However, if someone knows someone and calls about a person, that person will get the job." Having to advertise positions in two places (usually professional newsletter and Chronicle) reduces need to inquire informally as much as before. Do not have to advertise temporary positions and if you need to have someone in a hurry the informal network is
relieved upon.

Obs. 75: V. Knows department heads of all (specific area) departments in the country and would "simply call them up and ask them if they needed anyone." Usually somebody knows somebody and more personal contact is helpful. Occasionally jobs listed in advertisement, but not usual procedure.

W. (2) Over the last 20 years "administrators used to have to scratch around for people and now they just sit in their offices and wait for applications." To maintain hiring flexibility departments resist giving tenure now.

Obs. 76: V. Would not stay in higher education now: economics, pressures on faculty, other factors that doesn't make it always pleasant. Doesn't have sense of purpose as professor that he used to. Student body has changed, because no guarantee of work in this field; have to create a job sometimes; use survival tactics.

W. (2) Credentials, recommendations, interviews, documentation--a candidate has to make a strong case for why he should get a job. There are hundreds of applications which are narrowed down to top three candidates willing to come for interview. Jobs here tend to open up at last minute so they have to scurry around; most top candidates have made other plans, but lots of good people now available. National professional organization conference known as "slave market" which has organized listing, registration, and active recruiting. Some institutions have trade-offs based on rapport between certain major institutions, i.e., chairmen talk to chairmen and ask about students they would recommend; sometimes a shifting of personnel to certain institutions. Not seen as a negative thing and not much evidence of it happening in this department.

Obs. 77: V. Would check advertisements and bulletins from professional organization; attend annual meeting "slave market"; check graduate school placement bulletins. Would use personal contacts of faculty colleagues from here and elsewhere that he's developed over the years, as well as various department chairmen. Market in his field is disorganized now.

W. (1) Professional organization has separate publication listing job openings, but still key contacts in field are
those that have personal contacts at various institutions, e.g.,
graduate classmates and people you meet through career
pattern.

Obs. 78: V. Would choose a university doing exciting things in her
field and be a student again. During that time would attend con-
ferences, make contacts and would hear about positions;
through personal contacts you have a better approach to jobs.

W. (1) "What has remained prevalent is that if you know
someone you have a better chance to get a job, i.e., advocates
on jobs, personal friends, and relationships are helpful; that
is the same. If immediate supervisor thought you were good,
you were hired; not dependent on committee structure." More
red tape; more formalized; more institutionalized; more for-
amal applications and interviews. Whole inspection process
you have to go through.

Obs. 79: V. Would use graduate colleges placement center; read
journals. Would leave higher education at this point; do some-
thing in international and/or intercultural field.

W. (2) "Highly political: it's not what you know, it's
who you know. Hiring used to be based on performance abilities,
innate creativity, proving you could perform and do things.
Now it is publish or perish and that's wrong, because teaching
should be the main thing. Do not need a doctorate in all fields--
just an attempt by administration to change what is (and should
have remained) a college into a university."

Obs. 80: V. Would go through professional colleagues; she's
helped them get jobs and thinks it would work vice-versa.
Find out about letters from other institutions that are asking
for recommendations (find out from former students at those
institutions); get self-contacted. Need to have personal con-
tact so that person (self) is not an unknown quantity: that is
primary way job information moves through the system.

W. (2) Laws, such as open files on recommendations,
make that avenue less useful, so people have to make personal
contacts; thus, personal contacts have become more impor-
tant and stronger because of the laws. Placement offices have
lost strength, partially because of great decrease in number
of recommendations written.
Obs. 81: V. Call up one of the "old boy network" connected from graduate school days; strongest cohort group. Second strongest cohort group is former students who are becoming more influential, e.g., responsible for many of his speaking engagements, teaching at other schools. Because of professional association activity at national level, could have placed a dozen people in this specific academic area; smaller field and easier to get recognition.

W. (1) "Developed different rhetoric, but primarily approval of peer group of a given informal power structure"; structure works differently in various departments which affects informal power structure. In this department there are more cosmopolitans, i.e., have personal access outside of department into larger university community. Department also has "autonomous people who influence hiring external to university; others influence positions within this department only and not outside university."

"People who are hiring apply certain criteria when they don't want to hire someone and ignore it with others that they want." "Personality things" come in: no objection if they're explicit about it, but should not systematically exclude any group. Questions asked are becoming more subtle and careful, but with real decisions the "marbles still roll the same way." This department has been systematic in not hiring women and not giving them tenure. (One woman on staff is perceived as faculty wife only; main reason for her not being promoted.) Carefulness has come about because of concern with being reported, sued, etc.

In this department things were better when "chair had power and he was benevolent; had goals and not as concerned about being popular." "Much more oppressive now where faction is trying to get rid of those they don't agree with and hire others who are like themselves"; do this by voting as bloc in predetermined direction and "calling in their marbles."

Obs. 82: V. Write friends in higher education at other institutions; "big source of information about jobs." Not much else he could do with his high rank and salary. Difficult to move unless person had developed "considerable visibility" through publications which would give the hiring institution prestige. Tenure crunch also contributes to lack of movement generally. Might not stay in higher education.
W. (1) "Not from what I see; still try to hire people that come highly recommended by people they know personally. This department has never hired anyone they did not know personally or someone they respected knew them." All universities require advertising job openings, but "willing to bet most of those positions have been committed before they were posted. A person would have to write a lot of letters to openings advertised in the Chronicle before you'd find an opening."

Practically all fields are 2-3 year temporary with no stability, no tenure track. Some fields "did not track what was happening in the culture too well"; did some "self-defeating" things in regard to numbers allowed in classes, seminar topics, etc.; some problems could have been prevented.